

A
'68
K73

**A Study in New Testament Demon-Possession
and Its Contemporary Relevance**

**A Dissertation
Presented to
the faculty of the School of Theology
Claremont, California**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Religion**

**by
Richard T. Knowles
June, 1968**

Richard T. Knowles
June 1968

This dissertation, written by

Richard T. Knowles

*under the direction of his Faculty Committee,
and approved by its members, has been presented
to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of
Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF RELIGION

Faculty Committee

Wm. D. Ehrlich Chairman

John B. Cobb, Jr.

Howard J. Chinnell, Jr.

Date

June 1968

F. Thomas Trotter
Dean

PREFACE

The purpose of this study is: (a) to examine a New Testament exorcism story using the various critical methodologies; (b) to ascertain if enough relevant information can be obtained from the study of the New Testament story that some general conclusions can be drawn about a concept, understanding of, and treatment of disease (specifically psychological disorders) in the New Testament period; (c) if relevant data can be obtained to then explore where antiquity's concepts, etc., concerning psychological disorders and that of the present day meet or cross--if they do; and (d) if there are meeting or crossing points to explore these points.

It is not the purpose of this study to devise a concept or form of modern therapy which corresponds to the technique of exorcism in the New Testament. However, it is the purpose of this study to attempt to bridge the schism which now exists between the two periods in history by pointing to some very basic and underlying principles which were and are present today in the diagnosis, treatment, goals of treatment, and cure of psychological disorders.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	iii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Presuppositions	1
Jesus as a Worker of Miracles	3
The Problem of Materials	5
Demon-Possession and Exorcism	7
Purpose for the Inclusion of the Miracles of Exorcism and Healing in the New Testament	10
Exorcism in the Gospel of Mark	11
II. THE GOSPEL OF MARK	13
Translation of the Greek Text of Mark 5:1-20	13
Exegesis of the Text	15
Form Critical Considerations	27
Basic Presuppositions of the Pericope	32
Marcan Understanding of the Pericope	33
III. THE MATTHEAN PARALLEL	36
Translation of the Greek Text of Matthew 8:28-34	37
Exegesis of the Text	37
Matthew's Theology and Use of the Pericope	43
IV. THE LUCAN PARALLEL	47
Translation of the Greek Text of Luke 8:26-39	48
Exegesis of the Text	49
Luke's Unique Contribution	64
Luke's Understanding of the Pericope	68

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT SECTIONS	72
Variations in the Synoptic Witness	72
Similarities in the Synoptic Witness	74
Conclusion of the New Testament Sections	76
VI. THE CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE OF DEMON-POSSESSION	80
Changing Concepts	81
The Parallels	85
Demon-Possession and Modern Therapy Meet	91
The Demonic in the Thought of Paul Tillich	96
The Demonic in the Thought of Sigmund Freud	100
The Demonic in the Thought of C. G. Jung	101
BIBLIOGRAPHY	109

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Presuppositions:

When one is attempting to deal with any New Testament exegesis it is imperative at the beginning to make known the basic presuppositions which color the work. Therefore, in the next few paragraphs I will attempt to set these presuppositions down as clearly and concisely as possible.

First of all, in approaching any study of the New Testament, it is important to realize that Christology is present in the whole of the New Testament. This is true whether one is exegeting a given pericope in the Gospels or a Pauline letter. When dealing with the miracle stories in the New Testament, and particularly those traditions attributed directly to Jesus, most scholars immediately want to raise the question of the historicity of the material. From that point on the discussion evolves around that problem and ends up in an attempt to defend a given thesis.¹ I would like to avoid falling into this time old

¹For an excellent critique of this approach particularly addressed to the Gospel of Mark, cf., J. M. Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark (London: SCM Press, 1957); J. M. Robinson, "Mark's Understanding of History," Scottish Journal of Theology, IX:4 (December 1956), 394-409. While Robinson's works are directly addressed to the problem of history in the Gospel of Mark, I feel that this

pitfall by skirting the issue. I do not want to avoid the historical issue completely. However, I do want to place the historical question in a secondary category rather than in the category of primary concern.

Since the area of concern for this study is specifically related to the activity and work of the historical Jesus, it is imperative to also deal with my presuppositions with respect to Jesus. These presuppositions arise out of my own New Testament studies. While each presupposition may be a basic presupposition of certain individual scholars I will make little attempt to document these presuppositions.

(a) Jesus did not have a messianic consciousness, nor did he consider himself to be a divine being.

(b) Jesus applied no Christological titles to himself. I understand the Christological titles as being products of the post-Easter Christian congregation.

(c) Jesus did understand himself to be the eschatological messenger of God before the end of the aeon. This is evident in Jesus' message with its emphasis on imminent eschatology.

basic approach would be applicable and useful in the study of any of the Synoptic Gospels. Of course, the outcome would be different in each case.

(d) Jesus, as the eschatological messenger of God, understood himself as standing in the place of God.²

(e) Since Jesus understood himself as a messenger of God and as standing in the place of God, Jesus understood himself to be inspired by God.³

(f) It is also my belief that Jesus did perform miracles of healing and exorcism.⁴

(g) Jesus also accepted the contemporary religious thought patterns of his day concerning such matters as disease and their treatment.⁵

Jesus as a Worker of Miracles:

Due to the subject matter of this paper there needs to be further, detailed explanation concerning Jesus' performance of miracles of healing and exorcism. The fact that Jesus did perform miracles of healing and exorcism

²Rudolf Bultmann, "Primitive Christian Kerygma and the Historical Jesus," in Carl E. Braaten and Roy A. Harrisville (eds.), The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ (New York: Abingdon Press, 1964), p. 23; Ernst Käsemann, Essays on New Testament Themes (Naperville: Allenson, 1965), pp. 37ff.; and Ernst Fuchs, Studies of the Historical Jesus (Naperville: Allenson, 1964), pp. 11f.

³Käsemann, op. cit., pp. 32f.

⁴Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 22ff.

⁵To this even the most critical of scholars will agree. Cf., Charles Guignebert, Jesus (New York: University Books, 1959), pp. 202-203; and E. L. Titus, Essentials of New Testament Studies (New York: Ronald Press, 1958), pp. 67-68.

did not place him in any unique category or make him the first or last man in antiquity to do so. Quite the contrary would be closer to the truth. For in the history of religions there have been many men who performed miracles of healing and exorcism. Within the Jewish tradition we find quite a complete tradition built around Solomon which is felt to have some basis in the historical facts.⁶

Within the ancient cultures of Babylonia and Assyria there are also parallel traditions.⁷ Also, within Hellenism, we can find evidence of the same type of phenomenon.⁸ Even today in our present civilization there still exists in its rudimentary forms the same type of phenomenon.⁹ Therefore, the fact that Jesus performed miracles of healing and exorcism does not set him apart as unique within the history of man and, particularly, antiquity. Quite the

⁶Edward Langton, Essentials of Demonology (London: Epworth Press, 1949), p. 156; Jos., Ant., VIII, 2, 5; and Rudolf Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), pp. 231-32.

⁷Langton, op. cit., pp. 226-27.

⁸Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, pp. 231-32; and Karl Preisendanz, Papyri Graecae Magicae (Leipzig: Teubner, 1928), I, 160-61.

⁹Stanley A. and Ruth S. Freed, "Spirit Possession as Illness in a North Indian Village," Ethnology, III:2 (April 1965), 152-71; and John and Irene Hamer, "Spirit Possession and Its Socio-Psychological Implications Among the Sidamo of Southwest Ethiopia," Ethnology, V:4 (October 1966), 392-408.

contrary would be true--for in all the cultures mentioned above when their particular religious traditions are examined to any degree it becomes quite apparent that miracles of healing and exorcism are attributed to the various religious leaders within each separate tradition.

Problem of Materials:

I have stated that Jesus did perform miracles of healing and exorcism. Now I must address myself to the question of the materials in which miracles of healing and exorcism, attributed to Jesus, are to be found. The primary source of this material is to be found in the Gospels. But it is not as simple as it seems to deal with the issue; for it is my firm conviction that the writers of the Gospels were not committed to writing a biography in the modern sense as the word Gospel implies. But, rather, they were interested primarily in writing the meaning of Jesus' history as they had come to perceive it. In short, what we are given in the Gospel materials is not so much history as it is meaning of history. And, when one is involved in writing a meaning of history, interpretation becomes one's primary concern. The Gospel writers were not historians but theologians. Behind this primary concern exists one's other basic presupposition. With this said I must go on to state that the materials (including their presuppositions) with which the Gospel writers worked to form their version

of "The" Gospel, i.e., meaning of Jesus' history, had been shaped and molded by the Christian community. The various Christian communities had shaped and molded the material before it became a part of the community in which the Gospel writer himself worked. There existed no sacred tradition which could not be molded and shaped. It is very apparent from a critical examination of the early Christian literature that the traditions were quite fluid and malleable. The traditions were worked and reworked--molded and remolded by the various Christian communities. Therefore, what we have presently set down in the New Testament Gospels was as much a product of the early church as the life of Jesus. Therefore, when one confronts the problem of history in a given pericope one is really begging the issue. However, one must ultimately ask the historical questions--particularly with respect to the question as to whether or not a given tradition, or pericope, has any basis in the life of the historical Jesus.

Next, each individual pericope must be examined from every possible point of view. This is true even if one has drawn the conclusion that the individual pericope he is examining is not historical; for there are many other insights to be gained (e.g., What was the purpose for including this pericope or tradition? What is its place in the theology of the evangelist? What does it say about the

evangelist's understanding about the person and work of Jesus--his Christology? What does it say about the evangelist's understanding of cosmology and anthropology? What does it say about the evangelist's understanding of the relationship between Jesus and God--his understanding of salvation and his understanding of Christianity?)

With all this said I must continue by stating that the miracle stories within the New Testament are prime examples of this fluid and elastic tradition. These stories, through their transmission, have been so shaped and influenced by traditions inside and outside of Christianity that many of them have become very legendary in character, and it is very difficult to say if any given pericope has any basis in the historical Jesus.¹⁰ This is why the historical questions, in-and-of themselves, when it comes to dealing with the miracle stories is basically a fruitless endeavor.

Demon-Possession and Exorcisms:

At this juncture in the study the concepts of demon-possession and exorcism need to be further pursued and discussed. At a later point in the study a specific case in the New Testament of demon-possession and exorcism will be dealt with in detail.

¹⁰Martin Dibelius, Jesus (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1949), p. 86.

It is important for one to realize that the understanding of disease, which was in vogue at the time of Jesus, had taken many centuries to evolve. There were residual attitudes from these ancient cultures which were carried over to the time of Jesus, as well as new attitudes toward disease. Ancient Babylonia and Assyria had animistic concepts of disease and similar beliefs prevailed in ancient Judaism.¹¹

Insanity, or mental disorders, were the most mysterious of all diseases, and they were believed to be caused by demon-possession.¹² However, it is important to realize that not all diseases were caused by, and attributed to, demon-possession.¹³

Edward Langton¹⁴ has said that in the New Testament existence of demons or evil spirits is clearly assumed. However, their origin is not discussed. In contrast to the Gospels the apocalyptic literature and Rabbinic writings have allusions to the origins of the demons. The basic difference between the New Testament and the apocalyptic

¹¹Langton, op. cit., pp. 22, 147ff.; and J. S. Bonnell, "Jesus and Demon-Possession," Theology Today, XIII (July 1956), 210.

¹²Ibid.

¹³H. S. Songer, "Demonic Possession and Mental Illness," Religion in Life, XXXVI (Spring 1967), 121.

¹⁴Langton, op. cit., pp. 147ff.

writings is, that in the New Testament, demons basically cause physical or psychological evils. In the apocalyptic literature they also cause moral ailments. The background of the New Testament, in which its teachings concern the existence and multitude of evil spirits, is not only grounded in the apocalyptic literature of Judaism, but evidence clearly shows that numerous elements in the New Testament teachings have their sources in concepts which prevailed in Babylonia and Assyria, Persia and Greece--which in turn can be traced back to primitive animistic ideas.¹⁵

For one to fully understand and appreciate the significance of the miracles of healing and exorcism attributed to Jesus, one must fully understand and appreciate the world view of Jesus' day. What is important, then, is not only to understand the culture of the day but also the Sitz im Leben of a particular miracle story. The Sitz im Leben of a particular miracle story will vary depending upon the particular stage of development one is working with.

Within the early church demon-possession has its counterpart in possession by the Holy Spirit (cf., I Cor. 2ff.).¹⁶ The two possessions were differentiated from each

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Vernon S. McCasland, By The Finger of God (New

other based on the type personality and behavior which the person exhibited, i.e., good conduct--good spirit; bad conduct--evil spirit.¹⁷ The main factors, then, accounting for demon-possession as portrayed in the Gospels are pathological conditions of mind and body.¹⁸

Purpose for the Inclusion of the Miracles of Exorcism and Healing in the New Testament:

What was the purpose for the inclusion of the miracles of exorcism and healing in the New Testament? The specific reasons vary with each individual piece of literature. However, it is possible to make a few general comments about this issue which will be of value later. Miracles are the evidence of the presence of the inbreaking Kingdom of God (cf., Lk. 11:20).¹⁹ Miracle stories in general depict the exalted Lord of the community.²⁰ Exorcism of demons is of special significance to the church as

York: Macmillan, 1951), p. 6; Songer, op. cit., p. 121; and Werner Foerster, "δαίμων," in G. Kittle (ed.), Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmann, 1966), IV, 1-20.

¹⁷McCasland, op. cit., p. 7.

¹⁸Songer, op. cit., p. 155.

¹⁹C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to Mark (Cambridge: University Press, 1946), p. 84; and Dibelius, op. cit., p. 88.

²⁰Dibelius, Jesus, p. 85.

proofs of Jesus' Messiahship.²¹ Healing miracles are signs of the forgiveness of sins, not only because of the connection between sin and disease, but also the release from disease is a pledge of divine forgiveness (Mk. 2:1ff.).²²

Exorcisms in the Gospel of Mark:

Within the setting of the Gospel of Mark exorcisms have a specific function. The stage is set in the Marcan version of the Baptism narrative. It is at his baptism that Jesus receives the Spirit and is then driven into the wilderness by the Spirit. In the wilderness a struggle takes place on a cosmic level and on a historical plane between Jesus (the personification of the good Spirit) and Satan (the personification of the evil or unclean Spirit) (Mk. 3:22-30).²³ Jesus defeats Satan, and the stage has been set for the exorcism narratives within the Gospel of Mark (cf. 1:21f.; 1:34; 3:10ff.; 5:1ff.). According to Robinson²⁴ exorcisms serve as the nearest rapprochement of a mythological narrative to the historical events. Exorcisms, then, are the points in a historical narrative where

²¹Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, pp. 219, 226.

²²Ibid., pp. 84-85.

²³Reginald Fuller, Interpreting the Miracles (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), p. 72.

²⁴Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark, p. 33.

the transcendent meaning of that history is most clearly evident.²⁵ Mark carries the cosmic struggle between good and evil, i.e., Jesus as the good Spirit and Satan as the evil spirit, from the solitary encounter in the temptation narrative into the historical setting of the exorcism narratives.²⁶ It becomes very evident that Mark's purpose is to describe the cosmic struggle as taking place in historical occurrences.²⁷ It also becomes apparent, as we shall see, that after the first encounter between Jesus and Satan the demons are the only ones who know and recognize who Jesus really is (Mk. 1:24; 1:34; 5:6f.). The demons do this in the form of a confession. In all the exorcism narratives within the Gospel of Mark the demon or demons are expelled by a word or words. While Jesus preached about the Kingdom of God his miracles demonstrated physically what the inbreaking of the Kingdom of God would actually be like. Exorcisms were a physical demonstration of the breaking of Satan's power and the inbreaking of the Kingdom of God.²⁸

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Ibid., p. 34.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Cranfield, op. cit., p. 85.

CHAPTER II

THE GOSPEL OF MARK

There is a specific exorcism narrative in the Synoptic Gospels which epitomizes all of the points which I have attempted to make. This exorcism narrative is Mark 5:1-20 and its parallels, which is commonly referred to as the story of the Gerasene Demoniac. Let me begin by translating the Greek text as it is found in the Synopsis Quatuor Evangeliorum, edited by Kurt Aland, and published in 1964.

Translation of the Greek Text of Mark 5:1-20:

¹And they came to the other side of the sea into the land of the Gerasenes. ²And as he came out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit, ³who had his dwelling place in the tombs, and no one could bind him anymore, not even with a chain, ⁴because he had often been bound with fetters and chains, and the chains by him were broken and the fetters were broken, and no one was able to subdue him. ⁵And always night and day in the tombs and in the mountains he was crying out and cutting himself with stones. ⁶And seeing Jesus from afar he ran and worshipped him, ⁷and cried with a loud voice saying "What to me and to you (What do you have to do with me), Jesus, son of the Most High God? I adjure you

by God, do not torment me." ⁸For he said to him, "Come out, unclean spirit, out of the man." ⁹And he questioned him: What is your name? And he said to him, my name is Legion, because we are many. ¹⁰And he besought him much in order that he would not send them out of the country. ¹¹And there was near the mountain a great herd of pigs feeding. ¹²And they besought him saying: Send us into the pigs, in order that we may enter into them. ¹³And he allowed them. And coming out the unclean spirits entered into the pigs, and the herd rushed down the precipice into the sea, about 2000, and they were choked in the sea. ¹⁴And the ones who were feeding them fled and reported it in the city and in the fields; and they came to see what it is that had happened. ¹⁵And they came to Jesus, and they saw the demon-possessed man sitting having been clothed and being in his senses, the man having the legion, and they were afraid. ¹⁶And the ones who had seen, told them how it happened to the demon-possessed man and about the pigs. ¹⁷And they began to beseech him to depart from their borders. ¹⁸And as he embarked in the ship the demon-possessed one besought him in order that he might be with him. ¹⁹But he did not permit him, but says to him: Go into your house to your people and tell to them what things the Lord has done to you and shown mercy to you. ²⁰And he departed and began to proclaim in the Decapolis what Jesus did to him, and all marvelled.

Exegesis of the Text (Mk. 5:1-20):

At this point in the study it will be advantageous to concentrate on a verse by verse exegesis of the text.

Verse 1: This verse deals with the location of the pericope. And, also, serves to connect this pericope with the balance of the narrative of which it is a part. Most scholars agree that this verse is a Marcan redaction.¹ There is a great deal of discussion among the scholars as to the exact location of this pericope. The discussion centers on the question of whether or not Mark has the pericope occurring on Gentile or Jewish soil. However, it is my contention that the exact geographical location of the pericope is irrelevant to the primary topos of the pericope.²

¹Rudolf Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 210.

²It is my contention for numerous reasons which I will deal with in detail when I consider the question of the historicity of this pericope, that the geographical location is basically a tool to place the exorcism on a historical plane as a past event to serve Mark's theology. Cf., prior discussion on Mark's use of exorcisms. A secondary topos exists for this pericope which is its missionary character in vss. 18-20. This is only slightly enhanced by the pericope taking place in gentile soil and having Jesus perform an exorcism on gentile soil. However, if the first verse is completely disregarded as to the geographical location the pericope still has its missionary topos in vss. 19-20, which are all Marcan redaction.

Verse 2: In this verse Jesus is confronted by the demoniac, described as a man out of the tombs³ with an unclean spirit.⁴

Verses 3-5: In these verses we have a detailed description of the demoniac and his present condition. First, he lives among the tombs (cf., footnote 3). This is a common practice in antiquity and has a certain amount of significance as do all the characteristics of the demoniac. This we will see in detail later. Next, the demoniac could not be bound with fetters or a chain. This, also, was a common practice in antiquity to bind the deranged persons in an effort to keep the possessed person from harming himself as well as others.⁵ The fact that the demoniac is depicted as being able to break fetters and chains emphasizes the strength of the demon, the completeness of the possession, and enhances the magnitude of Jesus

³In antiquity tombs, deserts, and desolate areas were considered to be the dwelling places of demons. This concept was present in ancient Babylonian and Assyrian cultures. Cf., Edward Langton, Essentials of Demonology (London: Epworth Press, 1949), p. 149. This concept was also present in Jewish culture. Cf., I. Epstein (ed.), The Babylonian Talmud (London: Soncino Press, 1938), Per. 3b; Ber. 3b, 62b; Shab. 67a; and Sanh. 65b.

⁴"Unclean spirits" is special Marcan terminology for demons. Cf., Trevor Ling, The Significance of Satan (London: Allen and Unwin, 1961), p. 14.

⁵Hendrik van der Loos, The Miracles of Jesus (Leiden: Brill, 1965), p. 385.

as a miracle worker.⁶ The next section deals with a further detailed explanation of the condition of the demoniac. He is in the tombs and mountains night and day; and he is crying out and cutting himself with stones. Most commentaries pass over the detailed explanation of the demoniac's condition. However, it is interesting to note that in the Babylonian Talmud Gemara 3b,⁷ that a person is legally considered an imbecile if, and only if, he exhibits all of the above mentioned characteristics and actions. Also, an imbecile is not allowed to worship in the Synagogue. It will serve my purpose later if at this point the social connotations of the demoniac's behavior are emphasized. The fact that the demoniac lived among the tombs signifies that he was estranged, alienated, and no longer a useful member of society.⁸ The result of the demoniac's great strength depicts, also, that efforts had previously been made to safeguard the man from harming himself and others. However, this was done to no avail. His crying out in the night and day among the tombs and in the mountains depicts him as not being of sound mind--he was incoherent and

⁶Martin Dibelius, Jesus (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1949), p. 89.

⁷I. Epstein, op. cit., XIV, Seder Mo'ed. Hagigah, p. 12.

⁸John S. Bonnell, "The Demoniac of Gerasa," Pastoral Psychology, VII:66 (September 1956), 24.

alienated from himself.⁹ Also, the depiction of the demoniac as cutting himself with stones also indicates that he was in poor physical condition and re-emphasizes his mental imbalance. No person in full control of his mental faculties would go about cutting himself with stones, etc.¹⁰ All the symptoms combined emphasize and demonstrate the dreadful character of the disease.¹¹

Verse 6: Here the demon-possessed man sees Jesus and runs to him and worships him. This verse clearly indicates that the demon recognizes (perceives) who Jesus really is. This is quite remarkable in view of the concept of the messianic secret in the Gospel of Mark. The stage has been set for the demon's ability to recognize Jesus back in the temptation narrative (Mk. 1:12ff.). Jesus, in the temptation narrative, defeats Satan, the prince of demons, who knows who Jesus really is. Consequently, all demons know and recognize Jesus (Mk. 1:24, 34; 2:11). Jesus has command over the unclean spirits (Mk. 1:27). Therefore, the unclean spirits must obey Jesus.

⁹Ibid., p. 23.

¹⁰For parallels to this in the Old Testament, cf., I Sam. 16:14f.; 19:18f.

¹¹Bultmann, op. cit., p. 219.

Verse 7: In this verse one is confronted with the curious title, Jesus, son of the Most High God.¹² It is interesting to note that this is the confession of the demon, and, in fact, it is only demons who confer this title on Jesus (cf., Mk. 1:24). The concept of the messianic secret is kept intact by Mark, for humans do not know who Jesus really is, only the demons. Jesus is proclaimed Son of the Most High God in the form of a confession by the demon. When the demons adjure Jesus, in the name of God, not to torment them, again one is confronted with a common concept in antiquity--the notion of an exorcist torturing a demon which he has expelled.¹³ This could also refer to the concept in Rev. 20:10 which is the punishment God would inflict on Satan at the end of the

¹² ὁ υἱ τοῦ ἁγίου is rarely used in the Synoptics. Cf., Wilfred Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Tradition (Cambridge: University Press, 1953), I, 39. "'Most High' is a common name for the God of Israel on the 'religious frontier' between Judaism and paganism." Ibid., pp. 40-41. For more complete details consult ibid., p. 39, note 1, and C. H. Cave, "The Obedience of Unclean Spirits," New Testament Studies, XI:1 (October 1964), 96; G. Levi Della Veda, "El 'Elyon in Genesis 14:18-20," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIII (March 1944), 1-18. It is also a title which is used in Hellenistic Mystery Religions. Cf., W. Bauer, A Greek Lexicon of the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 857-58. Also for more Old Testament references cf., II Sam. 22:14; Dan. 3:26; 4:2, 24, 32; 5:18; 7:18, 22, 25, 27; Num. 24:16; Micah 6:6; and Is. 14:14.

¹³ D. E. Nineham, The Gospel of St. Mark (Baltimore: Penguin, 1963), p. 153.

world.¹⁴ These two concepts are not mutually exclusive. One could be, and probably is, a particular adaptation of the other. The demons at this point recognize that in the inbreaking Kingdom of God the eschatological event has begun. The phrase τί ἔραὶ καὶ σοί ("What to you and to me"), has its parallels in the Old Testament (cf., Josh. 22:24; Jud. 11:12; II Sam. 16:10; 19:22; and I Kings 17:18).¹⁵ This strange saying has the socio-religious connotation picturing the demoniac as estranged from God.¹⁶ It is also possible to draw the conclusion here that the person has fully identified himself with the demonic ego and that his normal self is forgotten. For, as Robinson¹⁷ has pointed out, the dialogue between Jesus and the demons (satan) takes place as if they were arguing with their physical tongues. Consequently, the cosmic struggle, mentioned earlier, is shown to be taking place in a historical occurrence. Mark has historicized the cosmic struggle in this pericope.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark (Cambridge: University Press, 1962), p. 75.

¹⁶Bonnell, op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁷J. M. Robinson, "Mark's Understanding of History," Scottish Journal of Theology, IX:4 (December 1956), 398.

Verse 8: In this verse Mark depicts the exorcism as having taken place. It is interesting to note that the exorcism is done by Word power.¹⁸ Mark not only has Jesus announce the Kingdom of God by Word in Jesus' teaching and preaching, but, also, when it does break in momentarily as it does in the miracles it is also done by Word power.

This verse is troublesome when viewed in the total context of the narrative vss. 1-20. It is redundant; for with verses 8 and 13 it appears that the exorcism takes place twice. Therefore, it seems that verse 8 is an intrusion into the basic narrative. Due to these points I agree with those scholars who feel that this verse is a result of Marcan redaction.¹⁹

Verse 9: In this verse one is confronted with two very unusual oddities in the Gospel tradition. The first oddity is the question by Jesus as to the demon's name.²⁰

¹⁸Exorcism by word power can be traced back to ancient Babylonian and Assyrian cultures. Cf., Langton, op. cit., pp. 26ff., 226-27.

¹⁹The most notable of these scholars is Bultmann, op. cit., p. 210. Also cf., Cranfield, op. cit., p. 177.

²⁰The question about the demon's name is common in magic, but is unparalleled in the New Testament. For nowhere else is Jesus represented as having need of such knowledge. Cf., Knox, op. cit., pp. 39, 41. Also, both in pagan and Jewish sources the wonder worker is depicted as having power over a demon when the name of the demon is known by the exorcist miracle worker. Cf., Karl Preisendanz, Papyri Graecae Magicae (Leipzig: Teubner, 1928),

The next strange occurrence in this verse is the name of the demon "λεγιών." There has been a great deal of material written in an attempt to explain this strange name. The most plausible explanation is C. H. Cave's²¹ position which explains that the narrative itself makes clear the meaning of the name Legion; "for we are many." The number of demons (many) also helps to clarify the reason for the demoniac's great strength. The number of demons also serves, then, to enhance the magnitude of the miracle.²²

Verse 10: In this verse the demons are depicted as asking a favor of Jesus²³--not to send them out of the country. The reason for this could well be explained on the basis of the normal dwelling places of demons (cf., footnote 3), and that, therefore, the demons did not want to leave their normal dwelling place. Also, according to

I, 166; III, 159, 500ff.; Cranfield, op. cit., p. 177. This is even more amazing when viewed within the context of all the exorcism narratives within the Gospel of Mark. For it has already been stated that Jesus had authority over the unclean spirits (Mk. 1:27), and therefore would not need the knowledge of the demon's name. Also, see the above discussion about the demon's knowledge who Jesus really is. But, most important of all, is the fact that here Jesus is depicted as using common magical practices to expel the demons.

²¹Cave, op. cit., pp. 95-95.

²²Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), p. 89.

²³Bultmann, op. cit., p. 224.

popular belief, demons must be granted a favor before they would leave a victim.²⁴

Verses 11-13: In the first of these verses a herd of swine is introduced. Next, a specific favor is requested by the demons. They ask to be sent into the herd of swine. Then Jesus is depicted as allowing the unclean spirits to enter into the herd of swine. This is also unparalleled in the Gospel tradition. Then the herd of swine (ca. 2000) rush over the precipice and are choked in the sea. These verses have a very curious parallel in ancient Babylonian exorcism customs.²⁵

The granting of the favor and the successful exorcism are demonstrated in the herd of swine rushing over the hill into the sea.²⁶ The phenomenon of the demons entering into the herd of swine and being choked in the sea

²⁴Nineham, op. cit., p. 154.

²⁵It was common practice in Babylonian exorcisms for an animal, usually a pig or kid, or a part of it, usually an ear, to be placed alongside the demoniac as a substitute for him. It was believed that during the ceremony the evil spirit would be compelled to pass from the demoniac to the animal which was then gotten rid of (destroyed) in some manner. Langton, op. cit., pp. 30f. The destruction of the swine could also possibly be explained as a parallel to this--particularly if the narrative has a pre-Christian origin.

²⁶T. A. Burkill, "Concerning Mark 5:7 and 5:18-20," Studia Theologica, XI:2 (1957), 159-66; Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, pp. 82ff.; and Campbell Bonner "The Technique of Exorcism," Harvard Theological Review, XXXIV

must be viewed within the context, specifically, of Mark 4:35-41,²⁷ and also the entire Gospel. The sea was also the dwelling place of unclean spirits, and Jesus had control over the sea (Mark 4:35-41).²⁸ Control over the sea was also a characteristic sign of divine power (cf., Pss. 89:8-9; 93:3-4; 106:8-9, and Isa. 51:9-10).²⁹ There is a parallel, then, between the calming of the sea and the exorcism of the demons.³⁰ One could even press the matter further and say that there is a parallel between the calming of the sea and the demon filled herd of swine plunging into the sea.

(January 1943), 47f. In this article Bonner points out that demons mark their departure by an act of physical violence, and he then sights the evidence for this in the literature of antiquity.

²⁷According to ancient Babylonian mythology, which is reflected in the miracle of Jesus stilling the sea (Mk. 4:35-41), and is a presupposition of (Mk. 5:1-20), and which was shared by the Jews at one time (cf., Gen. 1:1ff.), the original act of creation involved God in a desperate, but victorious, contest with the forces of evil and chaos. Evil and chaos were identified with and/or located in the waters of the sea. Nineham, op. cit., p. 146. The sea in the Old Testament is not only regarded as one of the dwelling places of the demons but also the realm of death. Cf., Ulrich Mauser, Christ in the Wilderness (London: SCM Press, 1963), p. 127; and Brevard S. Childs, Myth and Reality in the Old Testament (London: SCM Press, 1960), pp. 30ff.

²⁸Mauser, op. cit., p. 127.

²⁹Nineham, op. cit., p. 146.

³⁰Mauser, op. cit., p. 126.

It was common-place, that in the exorcism stories in all the various cultures of antiquity, for a demonstration of some nature to take place at the time of the exorcism to verify that the exorcism had been successful.³¹ Here, then, in these verses we have the granting of the demon's favor and the demonstration of the successful exorcism which is a miracle (miracle of exorcism), and this, then, has been developed into a miracle of punishment.³² The first miracle is a miracle which is demonstrated in an event. In verse 15 the successfulness of the exorcism is demonstrated in the restored condition of the man. The second miracle, the miracle of punishment, is entirely a different category of miracle story.³³ The miracle of punishment is also demonstrated in an event--the herd of swine drowning in the sea.

Verses 14-17: Here in these verses we have reported the reactions of the eye-witnesses to the two miracles.

³¹One only has to read the literature which is available in this area to verify this statement.

³²H. D. Betz, "The Problem of Christology in the New Testament," Lecture Course, School of Theology, Claremont, Fall '67-8; Jesus has already demonstrated his authority over the unclean spirits, but the story has Jesus pulling a trick on the unclean spirits in that the herd of swine rush head long into the sea and drown.

³³Ibid. This particular type miracle is very unusual in the Gospel tradition. Cf., Mt. 21:18ff.

First, the eye-witnesses flee and report to all in the area what had taken place. Then the eye-witnesses return and see the demoniac man sitting, fully clothed, and being in his senses or quiet mind. Then the eye-witnesses relate to the late comers what had happened, i.e., the two miracles. The result is φόβος by all, except the healed man. Due to the φόβος the people beseech Jesus to leave their borders. This section is marked by the account of the people's reaction, not only to the miracle of exorcism, but also to the miracle of punishment.

At this point it is advantageous to consider the socio-religious connotations of the healed man's restored condition. First of all, the fact that he was sitting quietly demonstrated that he no longer was acting in an erratic manner, but he was now quite normal in behavior. The tombs were no longer his dwelling place--he was restored to his people. He was fully clothed and was in full possession of his senses. Jesus, then, as the theios anēr miracle worker restored the possessed man back to his normal existence by casting out the demons. The implication of this is that when the Kingdom of God is established Satan's power will be broken and creation will be restored to its original condition.

Verse 18: In this verse the demoniac's response to the two miracles is given. He requests to become a

follower of Jesus.

Verse 19: Jesus rejects the man's request and makes him a missionary to his own people. As a missionary he is to tell his people about the merciful deeds of God done by and through Jesus. The entire direction of the story has been shifted in this verse. The miracle story has now been developed into missionary propaganda.³⁴

Verse 20: This verse is most likely a Marcan redaction.³⁵ In this verse Mark has the healed man returning to the Decapolis and becoming a missionary.

Form Critical Considerations:

After this general exegesis the next question to be confronted is the age of the narrative. As this is being dealt with, several other pertinent factors will also become apparent. I have agreed with several scholars' opinions that verses 1,³⁶ 8,³⁷ and 20³⁸ are a product of Marcan redaction. It is also probable that vss. 18 and 19 are the products of Marcan redaction. From this the judgment can be made that the story has a pre-Markan source.³⁹ At the

³⁴Ibid. ³⁵Bultmann, op. cit., p. 210.

³⁶Ibid. ³⁷Ibid.; Cranfield, op. cit., p. 177.

³⁸Bultmann, op. cit., p. 210.

³⁹The source of the pre-Markan stage is from the

same time there are also some sections of this story which are secondarily enlarged.⁴⁰ These secondarily enlarged portions of the story are verses 7,⁴¹ 9,⁴² and 13.⁴³ The section of the story from verses 14-19, is most probably quite considerably enlarged.⁴⁴ The source of the embellishments to the story is a very complicated problem. However, due to the missionary characteristic of these embellishments one can say without too much trepidation that they were the product of the early missionary church--just what missionary church is another question. To answer this question, specifically, will entail a short excursus into the area of the Christology of this text. The basic Christological pattern of this story in its pre-Markan stage is theios anēr Christology.⁴⁵ The next issue to be resolved

overall narrative (Mk. 4:37-5:43) source in which this pericope is contained. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, pp. 84ff.; and Knox, op. cit., p. 39.

⁴⁰Betz, op. cit. ⁴¹Ibid.; cf., pp. 18ff.

⁴²Ibid.; cf., footnotes 20, 21, and 22.

⁴³Ibid.; cf., footnotes 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30.

⁴⁴Ibid. Also consult the exegesis of these particular verses and footnotes 31 and 32.

⁴⁵Betz, "Jesus as Divine Man," mimeographed paper. H. D. Betz has pointed out that the basic ingredients for (theios anēr) Christology is present in the pre-Markan stage of the story. These ingredients are: (a) Divine man in its pure form is a miracle worker; (b) The Divine man stands in the place of God; and (c) Divine man uses magic to perform miracles.

is the Sitz im Leben of the pre-Marcian theios anēr Christology as found in the text. Both Bultmann⁴⁶ and Braun⁴⁷ contend that the original Sitz im Leben for the theios anēr Christology is Hellenistic Jewish Christianity, and I agree with their position. Consequently, the secondary and quite large embellishments of the story are the product of the Hellenistic Jewish-Christian community. It is from this source that Mark obtained the story. The primary purpose of the story in its pre-Marcian stage was missionary propaganda. The content of the propaganda was to convince people that Jesus was the Son of God who functioned as their Savior as theios anēr.

The next question to be raised is: Does this story have a Sitz im Leben within the life of the historical Jesus? As stated earlier, the miracle stories have so many legendary characteristics that it is difficult to posit in them any degree of assurance of their containing any historical credibility. The story of the Gerasene demoniac is no exception to this general maxim. In the methodology in the exegesis section I attempted to point out only a few places in the story where various parallels existed between

⁴⁶Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 50f., 130ff.

⁴⁷Herbert Braun, "The Problem of a New Testament Theology," Journal for Theology and the Church, I (1965), 169ff.

the story and the common thought patterns of Jesus' day and earlier antiquity. Due to these parallels, the highly legendary character of the miracle stories in general in the New Testament, also the function and purpose of the miracle stories, and the early church's overarching interest (which was to interpret and give the true understanding of the meaning of Jesus' life), I think that this story in its original Sitz im Leben cannot be attributed to an actual incident that took place during and in the life of the historical Jesus. Consequently, the story in its pre-Christian stage had another origin than the life of the historical Jesus.⁴⁸

From a form critical standpoint the story would be classified as a legend. The Christianizing of the legend was a product of the Hellenistic Jewish-Christian congregation. The original exorcism story was probably very sparse in detail, and its embellishment and Christianizing was due

⁴⁸For a complete discussion of this particular question consult the following literature. First, for the position that the story has a pagan origin. Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 231; Knox, op. cit., pp. 39; footnote 1, 39f.; and R. H. Fuller, Interpreting the Miracles (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), p. 54. For the position that the story was originally told about a Jewish exorcist, cf., Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, p. 101. For the position that the story is an authentic incident in the life of the historical Jesus, cf., Vincent Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel (New York: Macmillan, 1953), pp. 123-24; and H. van der Loos, op. cit., pp. 396-97.

to the interests of its users.⁴⁹ It is not at all difficult to conceive of how such a tradition could find its way into the early streams of oral traditions about Jesus.⁵⁰ This is particularly true in light of the knowledge that Jesus did perform miracles of exorcism, as did other religious figures in antiquity. If the early Christian community was to support its claims about Jesus, which were constantly under attack, Jesus had to be as great or greater a miracle worker as the other religious figures of his age or any other age. Miracles of healing, exorcism, etc., were insignificant in view of the belief that God had raised Jesus from the dead. The resurrection faith made many things believable and plausible. Also, the traditions about Jesus were fluid and not sacred in the sense that they could not be altered. Although the story is not an actual incident in the life of the historical Jesus it does have a connecting point with Jesus' actual life. Jesus did perform exorcisms, and this is an exorcism story--precisely

⁴⁹This would be particularly applicable to its development into two miracle stories, its missionary emphasis, the reaction by the people to the two miracles, and its primitive theios anēr Christology in its pre-Marcian stage.

⁵⁰Precisely at this point it is important to keep vividly in perspective the fact that the early Christian community was not as interested in history per se as moderns perceive and understand history. The early Christians were preoccupied with the meaning of Jesus' life and its interpretation.

at this point there is a connection between the two. This makes it even more understandable how the early Hellenistic Jewish-Christian congregation could attribute the story to the historical Jesus.

The very fact that this story is, in all probability, not an incident in the life of the historical Jesus does not distract from its value and its central points; for by observing the growth of the story through its various stages of development one may glean a great deal of relevant material about the early church and its understanding of Jesus' life in several areas.

Basic Presuppositions of the Pericope:

Previously it has been pointed out about some of the underlying factors as to the function and purpose of the miracle story at its pre-Markan Sitz im Leben in the Hellenistic Jewish-Christian congregation. However, there still needs to be clarified several of the basic presuppositions which undergird the story at this particular stage of its development. Undergirding the entire story as one of the basic presuppositions is a dualistic concept of creation.⁵¹ Also, there exists a dualistic concept of spirit possession.⁵² The concept consists of possession

⁵¹Cf., footnote 27.

⁵²Cf., Chapter I, pp. 7ff.

either by a good (holy) spirit or by a bad spirit (demon). Either type of spirit can possess a man. When a demon possesses a man, due to sin, God's creation (man) is perverted.⁵³ Responsible for this concept of demon possession is an animistic concept of disease. The creator God then sends a savior (Son of God) to restore the perverted creation.⁵⁴ The theios anēr savior casts out the demons by means of an exorcism and defeats the forces of evil and chaos. Man is restored to his full humanity or what one might call "new life."⁵⁵ The healed man has been restored to his full humanity--which means he is mentally and physically normal. He is restored to society and is socially acceptable. He is culturally re-oriented.⁵⁶ Thus we have the pre-Marcian Hellenistic Jewish-Christian understanding of the story. And from this one can ascertain the Hellenistic Jewish-Christian understanding of Jesus--Jesus is theios anēr who is the Son of God.

Marcian Understanding of the Pericope:

Mark has taken over this understanding of the story and then made some changes. These changes are visible by studying the Marcian redaction and viewing this story within

⁵³Betz, "Jesus as Divine Man," p. 7.

⁵⁴Betz, lecture notes.

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶Ibid.

the framework of the entire Gospel. Then, by fitting the content of this story into the context of Mark's total theology, Mark's understanding of the story can be deduced.⁵⁷ The basic findings, then, are as follows: First, Mark declares Jesus' work as Son of God as a secret.⁵⁸ Next, Mark historicizes the story as a past event in the life of Jesus.⁵⁹ Mark also correlates the miracle stories with the kerygma of Jesus.⁶⁰ And, finally, Mark puts the message and work of Jesus in an eschatological framework.⁶¹

Mark's understanding of the story is as follows: A dualistic concept of creation undergirds the story. Man becomes perverted (demon-possessed) due to sin. The restoration of creation, i.e., salvation, restores man's full humanity. Salvation is a mysterious act brought about by God acting in Jesus (Son of God) which is not made known until chapter 15:39. Salvation is understood only in terms of the kerygma of crucifixion and resurrection. For Mark

⁵⁷Betz, "Jesus as Divine Man," pp. 9ff.

⁵⁸It is a secret in Mark that Jesus is the Son of God and Messiah until 15:39. Betz, lecture notes.

⁵⁹Betz, "Jesus as Divine Man," p. 10.

⁶⁰For Mark the understanding of the miracle stories is set in the kerygma of crucifixion and resurrection. Cf., ibid., p. 9ff.

⁶¹The message of Jesus is cast in the expectations

the "new life" becomes one of discipleship. While the messiahship of Jesus is made known in the crucifixion and resurrection, the ultimate victory of God over the forces of evil and chaos will not take place until the parousia. The struggle between Jesus and the demons typifies on a historical or an earthly level the struggle begun at creation between God and the forces of evil and chaos. The victory of Jesus, who is standing in the place of God, over the demons is a glimpse of the Kingdom of God. The ultimate establishment of the Kingdom of God will not take place until the ultimate victory of God is won over the forces of evil and chaos which will culminate in the parousia (which is imminent) and the permanent establishment of the Kingdom of God. The permanent establishment of the Kingdom of God will be the restoration of all of creation from its perverted condition--which is sin and death.

of the parousia (Mk. 13) and the imminent end of the aeon.
Betz, lecture notes.

CHAPTER III

THE MATTHEAN PARALLEL

In the beginning chapters it was emphasized that the early traditions about Jesus were fluid, elastic, and malleable. No tradition about Jesus was so sacred that the users of the tradition could not mold and shape the tradition to suit their own particular interests. These interests were basically Christological; this is particularly true of the Synoptic miracle stories. The story about the demoniac of Mark 5:1-20, is a prime example of this phenomenon. We have seen how Mark used and changed the pre-Markan version of the story. We have also seen that the story had a pre-Christian origin and was most probably assimilated into the Christian traditions about Jesus by the Hellenistic Jewish-Christian congregation. Now, in this chapter of the paper, Matthew's treatment of this same story will be dealt with in detail.

The methodology of this chapter will be similar to that of the preceding chapter with the following exceptions: (a) In the exegesis I will be comparing the Matthean version of the story with the Marcan version; (b) also, if a certain point has been covered in detail in the previous chapter the work will not be duplicated. Consequently, I will begin this section of the paper by translating the Greek text of Matthew 8:28-34, as given in the

Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, edited in 1964 by Kurt Aland, and published in that same year.

Translation of the Greek Text of Matthew 8:28-34:

²⁸And when he came to the other side of the country of the Gadarenes, two who were demon-possessed met him, they were coming out of the tombs, they were exceedingly dangerous, so no one was able to pass through that way. ²⁹And behold they cried out saying "What to you and to us (What do you have to do with us), Son of God? Did you come here before the time to torture us?" ³⁰And there was far off from them a herd of many pigs feeding. ³¹And the demons besought him saying: If you cast us out send us into the herd of pigs. ³²And he said to them: Go! And they, coming out, went away into the pigs; and behold all the herd rushed down the precipice into the sea, and died in the water. ³³And the herdsman fled, and going away into the city reported all things and all about the demon-possessed ones. ³⁴And behold all the city came out to meet Jesus, and seeing him they besought him so that he might go from their borders.

Exegesis of the Text:

At this juncture in the paper the procedure will be to concentrate on a verse by verse exegesis of the text.

Verse 28: Here in the Matthean version of the story the geographical location is given as the land of the Gadarenes.¹ The next graphic difference between the Matthean and Marcan version of the story is that Matthew has two demoniacs confront Jesus rather than Mark's one demoniac who was possessed by many demons.²

¹Mark's location of the pericope is the land of the Gerasenes. Again, for Matthew, the geographical location is the means by which Matthew historicizes the pericope as a past event in the life of Jesus. Matthew not only takes over Mark's version of the pericope, he also acts as an exegete. Cf., G. Bornkamm, G. Barthand, and H. J. Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), pp. 166f. Matthew, by changing the location, may be attempting to present the pericope as taking place squarely on gentile soil. This could be an attempt by Matthew to maintain Mark's missionary emphasis. However, it is important to point out that any missionary emphasis is for Matthew (as is also the case for Mark) a secondary topos.

²There is a great deal of discussion among the scholars as to the reason for Matthew's changing the number of demoniacs. Some scholars cite that Matthew has done this in an attempt to combine two Marcan exorcism stories (Mk. 1:23-28, and Mk. 5:1-20) into one story. The basic evidence they give for this is: (a) The Marcan exorcism in (Mk. 1:23-28) is not to be found anywhere else in Matthew; (b) Matthew 8:29, they cite, parallels Mk. 1:24. For this particular position cf., J. C. Fenton, St. Matthew (Baltimore: Penguin, 1963), p. 132. Other scholars have pointed out that Matthew has Jesus healing two blind men (9:27), where Mark and Luke have Jesus healing only one blind man. The point is that Matthew has a tendency to have Jesus deal with two afflicted persons while Mark and Luke have only one. The point being that Mt. 8:28-34 is not an attempt by Matthew to combine two exorcism stories into one. Cf., Floyd V. Filson, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 155. Along these same lines I would point out that Matthew has dropped the strange name (Legion) in Mark's version of the

Matthew has retained the traditional dwelling place of the demons--the tombs.³ Matthew then condenses Mark's elaborate description of the demoniac's behavior into one brief statement--that the two demoniacs were so dangerous that no one was able to pass through the area.⁴ It is interesting to note, and also emphasizes the greatness of Jesus, that he is capable of confronting the demoniacs in spite of their fierceness. In the previous section of Matthew Jesus has shown he can control nature; now he is presented as being able to withstand and control the forces of evil presented by the two demoniacs.

Verse 29: In this verse Matthew has greatly reduced the Marcan version. Matthew has omitted the part of the demoniacs' running to Jesus and worshipping him. Matthew

story. The result is that Matthew uses the vehicle of two demoniacs to illustrate the same thing that the name (Legion) illustrates in the Gospel of Mark. Matthew reworks the Marcan version of the story. This is done in an effort by Matthew to correct certain "peculiarities" in the Marcan version of the story. An example of this is the whole episode in Mark with respect to the demoniac's name. Also, as will be emphasized later, Matthew's entire version of the story is completely subservient to his Christological interests. Cf., Bornkamm, op. cit., pp. 174f.

³Cf., previous discussion in chapter I and II. Also cf., Mt. 23:27.

⁴In this brief statement Matthew has attempted to focus in on what he perceives to be the central issue. Cf., Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 172. Also, Matthew is not really interested in the demoniacs but, rather, in Jesus as the Son of God. Ibid., pp. 172, 245.

has retained the strange saying (Τὴ ἡμῶν καὶ σοί),⁵ with one minor change: Mark's version (Mk. 5:7) is (Τὴ ἐμοί καὶ σοί) and Matthew has changed (ἐμοί) me to (ἡμῶν) us to coincide with his version of two demoniacs. Next, Matthew has changed the confession on the lips of the demoniacs from the Son of the Most High God to--Son of God (cf. 4:3, 6). Here again Matthew has acted as an exegete and corrected Mark's Christological confession by the demoniac.

The confession of the demoniacs is the central topos of the story and represents Matthew's Christological interpretation of the story.⁶ The entire story supports this Christological confession.⁷ Then Matthew has deepened or heightened Mark's reference to the eschaton.⁸ The demons, immediately after confessing Jesus as Son of God, refer directly to the final judgment at the end of the aeon (cf., Enoch 16:1; Book of Jubilees 10:8, 9; and Rev. 20:10). The eschatological aspect has been sharply brought into focus by Matthew.⁹ Matthew's use of the demons' statement

⁵Consult the previous discussion with respect to this saying in chapter II.

⁶Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 173.

⁷Also the confession of the demons shows that they have supernatural powers and insights. Fenton, op. cit., pp. 132-33.

⁸Cf., previous discussion in chapter II.

⁹Fenton, op. cit., p. 132.

about the final judgment also emphasizes the authority of Jesus, now in the present, before the end of the aeon. Jesus, as the Son of God, here and now has the power and authority to deliver up the demons to their eschatological judgment. Jesus exercises his eschatological position of Lordship already now, prematurely as it were, on the earth.¹⁰

Verses 30-31: In this section the herd of pigs is introduced. Then the demons ask a favor of Jesus.¹¹ Also, demons require some place to live (Mt. 12:43).¹²

Verse 32: Here the exorcism is depicted as taking place.¹³ The exorcism is accomplished by a mere word ($\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$) of Jesus.¹⁴ The demons then enter the pigs and

¹⁰Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 269. Also cf., (Mt. 28:18, 20). All of Matthew's Gospel is viewed through the perspective that Jesus of Nazareth is now he to whom all authority in heaven and on earth is given and who is present in his church to the end of the world. Ibid. Also consult the previous discussion.

¹¹Cf., previous discussion on the asking and granting of a request before an exorcism takes place.

¹²Fenton, op. cit., p. 133. Also cf., previous discussion in respect to dwelling places of demons.

¹³Matthew has cleared up the ambiguity in Mark; for Mark appears to have the exorcism taking place twice (Mk. 5:8, 13).

¹⁴Cf., previous discussion on exorcism by word power.

immediately the herd of pigs rushes down the precipice and dies in the water.¹⁵ Matthew has greatly condensed the Marcan version of this particular section of the story. There is no mentioning of the number of pigs. The request by Jesus for the demon's name has also been eliminated.¹⁶ In Matthew Jesus casts out demons by the Spirit of God (Mt. 12:28).¹⁷ Also, the unclean spirits are commanded to observe all things whatsoever Jesus commands them to do (Mt. 28:20). Matthew has retained both the miracle of exorcism and the miracle of punishment.¹⁸

Verse 33: In this verse Matthew reports the reaction of the eye-witnesses to the two miraculous happenings.

Verse 34: Here the people of the city come out and see Jesus. For the (Ἰησοῦν) in this verse refers to Jesus, not to the healed demoniacs.¹⁹ It becomes very apparent

¹⁵Cf., previous discussion about the demons leaving the possessed person accompanied by some act of physical violence to demonstrate the successfulness of the exorcism. Also cf., Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 172. Also consult the Babylonian exorcism practices.

¹⁶Cf., the previous discussion on the use of magic in the Marcan version of the story. This constitutes quite a subtle difference between Matthew and Mark--and represents Matthew's changing of the pre-Markan and the Marcan theios anēr Christological patterns.

¹⁷Filson, op. cit., pp. 36-37.

¹⁸Consult the previous discussion in chapter II.

¹⁹Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 172.

that Matthew has very little interest in the healed persons nor in Mark's concept of the "new life" which is discipleship; for these elements of the story have been eliminated by Matthew.²⁰ Matthew has done this for a specific purpose--he wants nothing to distract from the Christological confession of the demons in verse 29. By placing the complete story in service to the Christological statement, Matthew thereby makes it known that the story is a paradigm for this Christological statement.²¹ Matthew has eliminated the ($\psi\acute{o}\sigma\omicron\varsigma$) of the crowd. However, he has retained the request by the people for Jesus to leave their country. This, however, is viewed in Matthew in light of (Mt. 10:14f.).²²

Matthew's Theology and Use of the Story:

It is not enough in Matthew's Gospel that Jesus performs miracles; for Matthew has many doing miracles--false prophets (7:22), disciples of the pharisees (12:27), etc.²³ Miraculous deeds, in and of themselves, are not sufficient proof of the Messianic dignity of Jesus.²⁴ Only the evidence, that through the miraculous deeds of Jesus

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid., p. 245.

²²Fenton, op. cit., p. 133.

²³Filson, op. cit., p. 36.

²⁴Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 255.

the scripture and so the will of God expressed in them is fulfilled, gives these deeds of Jesus Christological meaning.²⁵ It is not miracles that attest to Jesus' messiahship. Rather, they themselves must first be attested.²⁶ Miracles are an expression of Jesus' obedience.²⁷ For Matthew the miracles of Jesus are to be understood as acts of Jesus' obedience to the will of God, and, on the other hand, they are understood as a legitimate part of his messianic work.²⁸ The messianic work of Jesus (for Matthew) is, above all, the carrying out of the will of God and the victorious carrying through of his righteousness.²⁹ In Matthew 9:13 Jesus is designated by this scripture quotation from Hosea as the one who is merciful in accordance with the divine will of God.³⁰ As previously stated in this exorcism, Matthew has Jesus exercising his authority now, already, before the end of the aeon, in the time of the church.³¹ This is attested to by Jesus' ability to deliver up the demons to their eschatological judgment now in the present.³² There is no messianic secret in the Gospel of Matthew; for Jesus exercises his Lordship in the present for all to witness. The mighty works of Jesus

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Ibid.

³¹Ibid., p. 269.

³²Ibid.

demonstrate that the eschatological drama has already begun.³³ While in the Matthean account of the story he does not concentrate on the healed man it is very evident that Jesus' defeat of the powers of evil reclaims men to mental and physical health.³⁴ This is done by the power of the Spirit of God in Jesus. This is clear evidence for Matthew and his readers that the eschatological time has begun to dawn.³⁵ This means that evil is being defeated and the Kingdom of God is advancing.³⁶ The miracle stories for Matthew then:

. . . show that the divine power is beginning to transform the present imperfect world, damaged by sin and sickness; now begin new days of life and health and blessing. It was common New Testament expectation that a new heaven and a new earth would be established. The mighty acts of Jesus showed the compassion of God and of His servant the Christ; they showed the power of faith; they showed believers the divine approval of Jesus; but above all they showed the rule of God being established and they gave promise of the full and final triumph of God's will in a perfect order certain to bless and protect God's loyal children.³⁷

The basic presuppositions which undergirded the Marcan version of the story, e.g., a dualistic concept of creation, of spirit possession, of salvation, etc., also undergird the Matthean version of the story. However, there is a subtle difference between Matthew's Christology and that of Mark's. Both have a theios anēr Christological

³³Filson, op. cit., p. 37.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid.

pattern in their individual accounts of the story, but they are different. These differences have been pointed out and dealt with. However, it will be well to point out the major difference which is the specific topic for discussion in this paper. Mark was interested not only in Jesus but in the restored condition of the demoniac and his personal response to Jesus' miraculous deed in his behalf. Matthew shows that he is not particularly interested in the two demoniacs' restored condition. Matthew's account of the story is strictly Christological, while Mark's use of the story has a more diversified application.

CHAPTER IV

THE LUCAN PARALLEL

In this chapter the focus of attention will center on the Lucan treatment, use, and understanding of the Gerasene demoniac story. In the preceding chapters Mark's and Matthew's treatment, uses, and understanding of this story have been discussed. In order to arrive at some conclusions in each of these areas it has been necessary to understand each writer's theology and the significance and place of miracles of healing, with specific emphasis on exorcisms, in their theology. It became apparent that both Mark and Matthew have similarities, but while they do have similarities they also have subtle and very distinct differences.

In this chapter Luke's understanding and use of miracles will be lifted up for scrutiny. To accomplish this the story will necessarily need to be set within its Sitz im Leben within the total Gospel of Luke and the book of Acts. Then, with the careful noting of Luke's redactional work, the significance of the miracles for Luke's theology can be deduced. In an effort to accomplish this task the methodology of this chapter will be similar to that of the preceding chapter.

The starting point, then, for this chapter will be to give a translation of the Greek text of Luke 8:26-39,

as given in the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, edited by Kurt Aland, and published in 1964.

Translation of the Greek Text of Luke 8:26-39:

²⁶And they sailed to the country of the Gerasenes, which is opposite Galilee. ²⁷And as he came out onto the land a certain man, out of the city, having demons met him, and for a long time he had not put on a garment, and did not abide in a house but among the tombs. ²⁸And seeing Jesus he fell prostrate before him and crying out in a loud voice said: "What to me and to you (What do you have to do with me), Jesus, son of the Most High God? I beg you, do not torment me." ²⁹For he commanded the unclean spirit to come out from the man; for many times it had seized him, and he was bound with chains and fetters and kept under guard, and tearing asunder the bonds he was driven by the demon into the desert. ³⁰And Jesus questioned him: "What is your name?" And he said: "Legion," because many demons entered into him. ³¹And they besought him not to order them to go away into the abyss. ³²And a herd of many pigs was there, feeding on the mountain; they besought him in order that he would allow them to enter into them; and he allowed them. ³³And the demons coming out of the man entered into the pigs, and the herd rushed down the precipice into the lake and were drowned. ³⁴And the herdsman seeing what had happened fled and

reported it in the city and in the farms. ³⁵And they went out to see what had happened, and they came to Jesus, and found the man from whom the demons had gone out having been clothed and being in his senses sitting down by the feet of Jesus, and they were afraid. ³⁶And the ones seeing reported to them how the demon-possessed man was healed. ³⁷And all the multitude of the neighborhood of the Gerasenes asked him to go away from them, because they were seized by a great fear; and he embarked in a boat and returned (to the other side). ³⁸And the man from whom the demons had gone out begged him to be with him; but he dismissed him saying. ³⁹Return to your house, and relate what God has done for you. And he went away throughout all the city proclaiming what things Jesus did for him.

Exegesis of the Text:

The next step, methodologically, will be to proceed with a verse by verse exegesis of the text.

Verse 26: This verse deals with the location of the pericope.¹ It also serves to connect the pericope with the

¹Luke has taken over Mark's account of the pericope and assumes that the incident was an actual incident in the life of Jesus. The pericope then has already been historicized by Mark and the geographical location served that purpose for both Mark and Luke. It also will become apparent in the ensuing discussion that the exact geographical location serves another purpose for Luke. Consult the pre-

balance of the narrative of which it is a part. Luke attempts to make it clear in this verse that Jesus has left Jewish territory and is on gentile soil.² This is the only time in Luke's Gospel that Jesus goes outside or beyond Jewish territory.³ This is done by Luke for a specific purpose--his interest in the gentile mission of the church.⁴ However, it is my contention that while the exact geographical location of this pericope is important to Luke it is irrelevant to the primary topos of the pericope.⁵ It should be pointed out that a portion of this verse is the result of Lucan redaction.⁶

vious discussion concerning the problems involved in the exact geographical location of the pericope.

²Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 49. For Luke it is important to establish the power and authority of Jesus on gentile soil because of Luke's personal interest in the gentile mission of the church. Ibid., pp. 49-50.

³Ibid., p. 49.

⁴Ibid. Luke, in taking over the Marcan account, assumes the historicity of the event. However, it is important for Luke to establish Jesus' power and authority on gentile soil because of his interest in the gentile mission. Therefore, Luke attempts to make it very clear that the pericope takes place on gentile soil. While this is extremely important to Luke, this is a secondary topos of the pericope.

⁵Consult the previous discussion in chapter II, page 15, footnote 1.

⁶"which is opposite Galilee." This, again, is an effort by Luke to establish the location of the pericope on gentile soil for the reasons already noted.

Verse 27: As Jesus disembarks from the boat he is met by a man,⁷ out of the city,⁸ having demons.⁹ Luke has depicted the demoniac as being naked.¹⁰ Next, in this verse, it is stated that the demoniac lives among the tombs.¹¹ The tombs are a common dwelling place for demoniacs in antiquity as previously discussed.

Verse 28: When the demoniac sees Jesus he falls on his face before him. This actually means that the demoniac worships Jesus. The act of falling prostrate before Jesus

⁷Luke retains Mark's version of a single demoniac meeting Jesus.

⁸"out of the city," is peculiar to Luke and is probably a result of Lucan redaction. Here again Luke is attempting to accurately locate the pericope as taking place on gentile soil. He is also attempting to make it clear that the demoniac is a gentile. All of this is done because of Luke's interest in the gentile mission. This short phrase also has the implication that the demoniac once lived in the city as a normal and useful member of society.

⁹Luke has retained Mark's version of one demoniac possessed by many demons. The multiplicity of the demons graphically illustrates the magnitude of the man's illness. Consult the previous discussion in chapter II. Also cf., W. R. F. Browning, The Gospel According to Saint Luke (New York: Macmillan, 1950), p. 93.

¹⁰This is probably a product of Lucan redaction. The reason for this is that this is peculiar to the Lucan version of the pericope. In the Marcan version it is not explicitly stated that the demoniac is naked; however, it is implied (Mk. 5:15).

¹¹Cf., page 16, chapter II., and footnote 3, page 16.

demonstrates that Jesus has authority over him, and the demons recognize (perceive) who Jesus really is. The stage for the demon's recognition and subjection to Jesus' authority has been set back in the temptation story. Jesus, in the temptation story, does not fall victim to Satan's temptation of him. At the end of the temptation story (Lk. 4:13) it is made clear that Satan is defeated, and he leaves until a more opportune time.¹² This means that a period free from Satan is now beginning.¹³ Consequently, the demons recognize Jesus and are subject to him.

Next, is the strange saying by the demoniac (τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί), "What do you have to do with me?"¹⁴ As previously pointed out this saying has the socio-religious connotation picturing the demoniac as estranged from God.¹⁵

It is also possible to say that the person has fully identified himself with the demoniac ego and that his

¹²Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 28; H. A. Kelly, "Devil in the Desert," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVI:2 (April 1964), 197; and Betz, "Jesus as Divine Man," p. 12. Satan does not return until Lk. 22:3.

¹³Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 16.

¹⁴Old Testament parallels: Jud. 11:12; 1 K. 17:18; 2 K. 3:13; 2 Sam. 16:10; 19:22; New Testament parallels: Mt. 8:29; Mk. 1:24; 5:7; and Jn. 2:4. Also cf., Philostr. IV:25. Consult previous discussion in chapter II, page 20.

¹⁵J. S. Bonnell, "Demoniac of Gerase," Pastoral Psychology, VII:66 (September 1956), 25. Also consult previous discussion in chapter II, page 20.

normal self is forgotten.¹⁶ Next, comes the demoniac's Christological confession. Luke has retained the curious title, Jesus, son of the Most High God.¹⁷ Jesus is proclaimed son of the Most High God in the form of a confession.¹⁸ The demons then beg Jesus not to torment them.¹⁹ While the demons' begging of Jesus not to torment them may refer to the concept in Rev. 20:10, which is the punishment God would inflict on Satan at the end of the aeon, Luke's concept of the eschaton is not the same as Mark's or Matthew's. This will be discussed in detail later. Luke at this point has changed the Marcan version; for in the Marcan version the demons call upon Jesus in the name of God not to torment them (Mk. 5:7).²⁰ While the central topos of the pericope is the demoniac's confession, it is not the only interest Luke has in using the story.

¹⁶If Robinson's thesis is applied to Luke then this is applicable. Cf., chapter II, page 20 and footnote 17, page 20.

¹⁷Consult the previous discussion about this title in chapter II, page 19 and footnote 12 on that same page.

¹⁸There are two other instances in Luke where demons, in the form of a confession, confess Jesus as the Son of God (Lk. 4:34, 41). There are also references to many other exorcisms in Luke's Gospel (Lk. 8:2; 11:14ff.), but in none of these is Jesus proclaimed Son of God.

¹⁹In antiquity there is a common notion of an exorcist torturing a demon which he has expelled. Cf., the previous discussion, chapter II, pages 19f.

²⁰The reason for Luke's doing this is not known.

Luke is much too sophisticated a theologian-historian to use the story for its Christological confession only.

Verse 29: In the Marcan version of the story it was discussed that Mark appeared to have the exorcism taking place twice (Mk. 5:8, 13). Luke appears to have repeated Mark's same clumsy construction, for in this verse and also in verse 32 the exorcism is depicted as taking place.²¹

Jesus commands²² the unclean spirits to come out of the man. Jesus not only announces what the Kingdom of God will be like, but Luke says (Lk. 11:20) that Jesus casts out demons by the finger²³ of God, and when this occurs "the Kingdom of God has come upon you." In short, the exorcisms graphically demonstrate the breaking of Satan's power and demonstrate for all to witness just what the Kingdom of God will be like in the future eschaton.

In the balance of this verse more symptoms of the man are given. These symptoms demonstrate and emphasize

²¹It is possible that verse 29 is a general statement and that the following verses are intended to be a detailed explanation of the exorcism.

²²Consult the previous discussion on exorcism by word power. Cf., chapter II, pages 21f., and the same page footnote 18.

²³There is some debate as to whether this should be Spirit of God. Cf., C. S. Rood, "Spirit or Finger," Expository Times, LXXII (February 1961), 157-80.

the magnitude of the demoniac's sickness. They also emphasize the power of Satan within the man. These symptoms illustrate that many times the demoniac was driven into the desert by the demons within him.²⁴ So great was the demon-possession and the power of the demons within the man that he was not only bound with fetters and chains, but he was also kept under guard.²⁵ Still, he would break the fetters and chains and be driven into the desert. Luke (as well as Mark) wants his readers to know that this was no ordinary case of demon-possession, but it was one of great magnitude.²⁶ The purpose for this was to graphically demonstrate that Jesus had the power and authority to break the power of Satan in any circumstance during his ministry--for Jesus was the Son of God during his life.²⁷ While

²⁴It is possible that the reference here to the demons driving the man into the desert could possibly be a direct reference to the dwelling place of the demons. It could possibly be an attempt to tie this exorcism story directly to the temptation of Jesus in the desert by Satan. It is probably connected with Luke's reference that demons seek rest in waterless places (Lk. 11;24). Also cf., Kelly, op. cit., p. 195.

²⁵"Under guard," is also peculiar to Luke and is probably a result of Lucan redaction.

²⁶Luke gives this particular exorcism story more attention than any other exorcism story in his Gospel. It is very doubtful that this was done by Luke arbitrarily.

²⁷Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 176. It is important if one is to understand Luke's use of this exorcism story that it was a past event--for the time of Jesus is a past event. Ibid., p. 28.

Luke has taken over many details of Mark's version of the story, it is also apparent that he has made changes in the story and has omitted some of Mark's details.²⁸

The fact that the demoniac was bound and kept under guard also shows that efforts had been previously made to protect the man from harming himself and others.²⁹ These symptoms have the socio-religious connotations that this man was not a useful member of society. He was estranged from himself (for he had fully identified himself with his demonic ego).³⁰ He was estranged from his family, and he was estranged from God. Also, he was not of sound mind nor in good physical condition.

Verse 30: In this verse Luke has retained the Marcan version (cf., Mk. 5:9) with one minor change--the explanation of the name Legion. However, in essence, both explanations are the same. It has been previously explained that Jesus' questioning of the demon is quite unparalleled in the New Testament tradition, but it is a

²⁸Luke has eliminated some of the symptoms (Mk. 5:5), etc.

²⁹Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, p. 89.

³⁰Consult the previous discussion in chapter II, page 20.

common magical practice.³¹ Also, the name Legion³² is quite unique within the New Testament tradition. Luke then has Jesus using the common magical practices of Judaism and paganism to expel the demons. The name Legion serves to show that the man is possessed by many demons. The number of demons serves to enhance the magnitude of the miracle.³³

Verse 31: In this verse the demons are depicted as asking a favor of Jesus--not to send them into the abyss.³⁴ The abyss probably refers to the prison for unclean spirits.³⁵ The abyss is also the dwelling place of the dead (Rom. 10:7; Rev. 20:3).³⁶ The abyss is also connected with the depths of the sea (cf., Rom. 10:7).³⁷ And the

³¹Cf., chapter II, pages 21f., and footnote 20 on that same page.

³²Cf., chapter II, page 22.

³³Dibelius, op. cit., p. 89.

³⁴In Mark's account of the story the demons ask Jesus not to send them out of the country (Mk. 5:10). So the abyss is a Lucan redaction.

³⁵F. W. Farrar, The Gospel According to St. Luke (Cambridge: University Press, 1903), p. 223.

³⁶A. R. C. Leaney, The Gospel According to St. Luke (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. 157.

³⁷Ibid.

depths of the sea is connected with the primeval ocean (Ps. 93; 104:5-9; 65:7; 89:9; 46:3).³⁸ The primeval ocean is connected with the ancient Babylonian creation myth which was discussed previously (cf., chapter II, footnote 27, page 24). In this way Luke also ties this exorcism story to the preceding story about stilling the sea. One story demonstrates the power and authority of Jesus to defeat Satan in the natural elements--the other story demonstrates the power and authority of Jesus to defeat Satan within the human sphere. The demons also recognized that Jesus now had the power and authority to send them to their final dwelling place. Also, according to popular belief, demons must be granted a favor before they would leave a victim.³⁹

Verses 32-33: In these verses a herd of pigs is introduced. Then the demons are depicted as asking a specific favor of Jesus--to allow them to enter into the pigs.⁴⁰ Jesus grants their request and allows them to enter into the pigs. This is also unparalleled in the New Testament tradition. Luke drops Mark's reference to the

³⁸G. B. Caird, The Gospel of St. Luke (Baltimore: Penguin, 1963), p. 121.

³⁹D. E. Nineham, The Gospel of St. Mark (Baltimore: Penguin, 1963), p. 154.

⁴⁰According to Luke 11:24 demons seek their rest in waterless places. The reason for this is that their final resting place is the abyss.

specific number of pigs (Mk. 5:13).⁴¹ Next, the exorcism is again depicted as taking place.⁴² The demons enter into the pigs, and then the herd rushes down the precipice and drowns in the lake. The lake motif is a motif which is peculiar to Luke.⁴³ It is probably intended as a counterpart to the mountain motif in Mark.⁴⁴ The mountain reaches up to heaven, the lake down to the abyss.⁴⁵ The lake for Luke is to be understood only as a boundary.⁴⁶ The lake is also to be understood as the primeval ocean.⁴⁷ Jesus had control over the sea (Lk. 8:25).⁴⁸ Control over the sea was also a characteristic sign of divine power (cf., Ps. 89:8-9; 93:3-4; 106:8-9; and Isa. 51:9-10).⁴⁹ There is also a direct relationship between the calming of the

⁴¹It is not known why Luke deletes the exact number of pigs--probably he felt it to be a superfluous detail.

⁴²Cf., verse 29.

⁴³Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 44.

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 44f.

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 39.

⁴⁷This is not specifically stated by any of the scholars, but it is my contention that this ties into the entire motif of creation and the eschaton. The primeval ocean is also the final resting place of the demons.

⁴⁸The sea, primeval ocean, and lake are all synonymous and refer to the same phenomenon.

⁴⁹Nineham, op. cit., p. 146.

sea by Jesus and the exorcism of demons.⁵⁰ Both are characteristic signs of divine power. There is probably, then, a correlation between the calming of the sea, which is the final resting place of the demons, and the herd of pigs drowning in the lake. Conzelmann⁵¹ thinks the (ἀπεπνίχθη) of verse 33 refers only to the herd of pigs and not to the demons. The demons are only driven away--sent out of the world back to the place to which they belong. This is possible, but it would seem that the demons belong in their final resting place--the abyss (i.e., the lake). For in Conzelmann's⁵² own words, "in Jesus' deeds one sees an image of salvation." Would not an image of salvation also include the sending of the demons to their final judgment --i.e., resting place? Jesus' deeds are, for Luke, the evidence of the time of salvation which "arrived" with Christ.⁵³ However, this time of salvation is of a specific duration and is not the time of final salvation.

When one demands signs, the answer one receives from Jesus is the preaching of repentance.⁵⁴ What emerges,

⁵⁰Ulrich Mauser, Christ in the Wilderness (London: SCM Press, 1963), p. 126.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 50.

⁵²Ibid., footnote 2, page 192.

⁵³Ibid. This time of salvation is of limited duration--limited to the time of Jesus' ministry. Ibid., p. 16.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 192.

then, is that a sign is given--it cannot be demanded.⁵⁵ The purpose of the sign is to bear witness and to prove--but it is misunderstood (Lk. 8:37).⁵⁶ Luke has retained the miracle of punishment.⁵⁷ Miracles of punishment are rare in the New Testament (cf., Mt. 21:18ff.). However, they are a common occurrence in the Old Testament (cf., Gen. 3:14ff.; 6:13ff.; 19:15ff.; Ex. 7:8ff.; 8:1ff.; 9:1ff., etc.).

It is also a common concept in antiquity that when an exorcism takes place the demon or demons departure is marked by some physical act of violence (cf., Lk. 4:35).⁵⁸ This act of violence demonstrates physically that the exorcism has been successful. It is also an ancient concept that when an exorcism is to take place, a young kid or pig (or some portion of it, usually an ear) is placed beside the demoniac and the demon or demons are believed to pass into the animal--then the animal is destroyed in some manner.⁵⁹ Since this particular demoniac had been possessed by many demons, their successful expulsion would necessarily entail an act of extreme violence--a herd of pigs

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 193.

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷Betz, lecture notes. Also cf., Mt. 21:18ff.

⁵⁸There is an excess of literature to verify this statement.

⁵⁹Cf., chapter II, footnote 25, page 23.

rushing into the lake and drowning. It should be apparent that many concepts are contained in the simple statement that the demons entered into the pigs, and then the herd of pigs rushed down the precipice and were drowned in the lake. Its full meaning may be completely lost to us.

Luke has retained the two miracles in Mark's version of the story. The first miracle is the miracle of the exorcism itself. Its successfulness is demonstrated in the restored condition of the man (Lk. 8:35). The second miracle, the miracle of punishment, is attested to by the destruction of the herd of pigs. The second miracle is an entirely different category of miracle story from the first miracle.⁶⁰

Verses 34-37: In these verses the reaction of the eye-witnesses to the two miracles is given. First, the eye-witnesses fled and reported to all in the area (including the city) what had taken place. The city probably refers to the city where the demoniac once lived as a normal person before he became possessed. Then all the people went out to Jesus, and they found the healed man sitting down.⁶¹

⁶⁰Consult the previous discussion in chapter II, pp. 25f.

⁶¹Before, the man had been running about, because the demons would drive him into the desert. This would now indicate the demons no longer had any control over him.

He was fully clothed.⁶² And he had possession of his senses.⁶³ The result was (φόβος) by the crowd. Then the eye-witnesses related to the others how the exorcism had taken place. This implies that the eye-witnesses told the others, not only about the miracle of exorcism, but also about the miracle of punishment. Consequently, all the people were seized by a great fear with the result that they asked Jesus to leave (for they did not understand). Jesus, as the Son of God, who was--theios anēr miracle worker restored the possessed man back to his normal condition (wholeness) by casting out the demons (i.e., breaking Satan's power). The implication of this is--that the Kingdom of God means to break the power of Satan, by which he (Satan) perverts man, and to restore man to his original condition (wholeness of life). The Kingdom of God means a condition or mode of existence that is free from Satan's perversive powers. In fact, Satan will be sent to his final resting place--the abyss.

⁶²Before, the demoniac was naked--a symbol of estrangement and was symptomatic of his total condition. Being clothed would indicate the man's restoration to his normal self.

⁶³Before, the man had identified fully with his demonic ego--now he was himself and no longer identified with the demonic ego.

Verse 38: The demoniac's response to the two miracles is given in this verse--he asks to become a follower of Jesus.

Verse 39: Jesus denies the healed man's request. Rather, he commissions him to be a missionary. If one takes seriously Luke's attempt at depicting this pericope as taking place on gentile soil and the demoniac being a gentile, then here Luke has depicted Jesus' commissioning of a gentile to be a missionary to his own people. Jesus also relates to the healed man the responsibilities of his mission--to tell to all what God has done for him. This also underscores the reality that what Jesus does is the action of God.⁶⁴ In this verse the entire direction of the pericope has been shifted. The miracle story has now been developed into missionary propaganda.⁶⁵

Luke's Unique Contribution:

It would appear that Luke's understanding of this story is similar to Mark's. However, if one sets this pericope within its Sitz im Leben within the entire framework of Luke-Acts,⁶⁶ quite a unique difference emerges.

⁶⁴Leaney, op. cit., p. 157.

⁶⁵Betz, lecture notes.

⁶⁶The Gospel of Luke cannot be fully understood apart from the book of Acts. Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 17.

Not taking into consideration Mark's concept of the messianic secret, the unique thing about Luke, as compared to Mark, is Luke's concept of history. Luke has come up with a unique concept--a history of salvation or Heilsgeschichte.⁶⁷ One's understanding of Luke's concept of a history of salvation or redemption is vitally important if one is to understand the significance of the miracles within Luke's thought--and, more specifically, miracles of exorcism.

Luke distinguishes between three specific periods in the history of salvation (cf., Lk. 16:16 and 13:25).⁶⁸ The first period is that of the period of Israel (Lk. 16:16).⁶⁹ The next period is defined by the period of Jesus' ministry.⁷⁰ This period is free from Satan and is

These two books need to be considered as a two volume work. The Gospel of Luke deals with a specific period in the history of salvation which is a past event designated to a specific and limited period in that history. Ibid., p. 28.

⁶⁷Ibid., pp. 137ff.; C. K. Barrett, Luke the Historian in Recent Study (London: Epworth Press, 1961), p. 42; and Betz, "Jesus as Divine Man," p. 12. Luke has been forced to re-think the entire concept of salvation (i.e., Kingdom of God), because the imminent establishment of the Kingdom of God as put forth in Mark's Gospel has not taken place. Due to this Luke has come up with the theological concept of the history of salvation.

⁶⁸Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 16.

⁶⁹Ibid.

⁷⁰Ibid.

the period of salvation.⁷¹ The next period of time is the time of the Spirit or of the church which is the time since the Ascension.⁷² The Parousia for Luke does not represent a stage within the course of the history of salvation, but rather represents the end of the history of salvation.⁷³ The time of Jesus' ministry is a time free from Satan; for Satan leaves Jesus after the temptation (Lk. 4:13) and does not return until he (Satan) enters Judas (Lk. 22:3). In this period of time Jesus is the theios anēr who is effectively at work.⁷⁴ Jesus' ministry marks the center of the history of salvation. Jesus' miraculous deeds during this period of time gives one an image of salvation.⁷⁵ Consequently, the Kingdom of God is removed to a metaphysical realm (cf., Lk. 17:20ff.).⁷⁶ Therefore, Luke's eschatology is futuristic.⁷⁷ In Mark's theology he presses the issue

⁷¹Ibid. What is happening during the ministry of Jesus is not the last times, but the interval between the period of Israel and the period of the church. Ibid., p. 28. The period of Jesus' ministry, the time which is sharply defined (cf., Lk. 4:13 and 22:3), is meant to be a clear manifestation of salvation. Ibid., footnote 2.

⁷²Ibid., p. 16.

⁷³Ibid., p. 17.

⁷⁴Betz, p. 12.

⁷⁵Conzelmann, op. cit., p.28.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 113.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 231. As compared to Mark's eschatology which is imminent.

of the nearness of the eschaton and its final judgment. In Luke-Acts it is not the nearness of the eschaton and its final judgment, but the sureness of the eschaton with its final judgment, even though it is removed to a futuristic event. Ideas about the parousia as imminent are deliberately removed, and in their place attention is directed to the period of time between the Ascension of Jesus and the final judgment (cf., Acts 1:6-8). Luke, then, has made a conscious distinction between the past activity of Jesus during his ministry and the present (i.e., the time of Luke) time of the church--the latter being conceived as an epoch of considerable duration. When Luke does away with the idea of an imminent eschaton he organizes the entirety of the history of salvation and describes it under the concept of the plan of God, the divine determiner of history.⁷⁸ Jesus is placed in the center of/or middle of the history of salvation with his death part of the divine plan (cf., Lk. 18:31f.; 22:22; 24:26; 46-7; and Acts 17:3). For Luke, Jesus' prophecy about his own death and resurrection, together with the scriptural prophecies, is decisive proof that Jesus is the Christ and that God raised him from the dead.⁷⁹ Jesus is the first to be

⁷⁸Ibid., pp. 149ff.

⁷⁹Paul Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," in Walther Eltester (ed.), Neutestamentliche

resurrected by God from the dead.⁸⁰ For Luke, Jesus, during his earthly ministry, is already Christ, the Son of God.⁸¹

Luke's Understanding of the Pericope:

This exorcism story is, for Luke and his readers, a glimpse or preview of what the Kingdom of God will be like when it occurs in the distant future. It also serves the purpose of acting as an example for what the Christians are to do between the time of the Ascension and the Parousia--they are to tell of the merciful deeds of God worked through Jesus--the Christ. They are also to combat evil in the same manner Jesus did. They are to be messengers of the "Good News" concerning the Kingdom of God.

The basic presuppositions which undergird this story for Luke are similar to Mark's⁸²--with the exceptions discussed above. Luke takes over Mark's understanding and treatment of the story and makes the following changes: (a) There is no messianic secret in Luke's Gospel. Jesus was

Studien fur Rudolf Bultmann (Berlin: Topelmann, 1954), p. 174.

⁸⁰Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 230.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 176.

⁸²Consult the previous discussion in chapter II, pp. 32ff.

the Christ, the Son of God, for all to witness--but this was misunderstood at times; (b) Luke sets the pericope within a new concept of history--a history of salvation; (c) Luke changes the imminent eschatology of Mark to a futuristic eschatology.

In the following paragraph I will attempt to set down Luke's understanding of the story. A dualistic concept of creation undergirds the story. A dualistic concept of spirit possession also undergirds the story. Man becomes perverted (demon-possessed) due to sin. The restoration of creation (i.e., a glimpse of salvation) restores man's full humanity. This restoration of creation is brought about by the creator God sending his Son, Jesus the Christ, to save the creation. While Jesus' act is a glimpse of salvation, it is brought about by God acting in Jesus (the Son of God) for all to witness and see, but it is many times misunderstood. The time of Jesus' ministry is a time free from Satan, but Satan does return and will remain until the ultimate establishment of the Kingdom of God in a futuristic event--the Parousia. Satan was responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus, but his crucifixion and death was still part of God's plan of the history of salvation. God raised Jesus from the dead, and he was installed as Cosmocrator (κοσμοκράτωρ). Satan marks his return by entering Judas--whom he perverts--all of creation is again subject to the perversion of Satan--this will be

the case until the Parousia at which time Satan will be sent to his final judgment (i.e., the abyss). Salvation, then, is to be understood in the terms of the kerygma of Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, and Parousia. The struggle between Jesus and the demons typifies, on a historical or earthly level, the struggle begun at creation between God and the forces of evil and chaos. The victory of Jesus, who is standing in the place of God, over the demons is a glimpse of the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God would be a mode of existence free from Satan's perverse power. The ultimate establishment of the Kingdom of God will not take place until the ultimate victory by God is won over the forces of evil and chaos which will culminate in the Parousia, a futuristic event, and will permanently establish the Kingdom of God. Until that time Jesus' life is the example for the church to follow. The permanent establishment of the Kingdom of God will be the restoration of all of creation from its perverted condition which is sin and death. It will also result in the final judgment for the forces of evil and chaos.

The demoniac in his perverted state represents the perverse power of Satan. He is alienated from himself, his family, society, and God. It might be said that he is in a state of sin and death. When Jesus casts out the demons the man is completely restored in all levels of his being and relationships. He then becomes a missionary, telling

of God's merciful deeds. When a man receives salvation (as a gift) then he is restored or given his full humanity. Man's response to this is obedience to Jesus' command.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT SECTIONS

It has become very obvious that many similarities and differences exist in the various versions of this story within the Synoptic Tradition. In the beginning of this section these differences and similarities will be pointed out. The final portion of this section will be devoted to making some general statements which will be the basis for the concluding chapter.

Variations in the Synoptic Witness:

In chapter II the pre-Markan version of the story was given in detail, and it became obvious, from noting the Marcan redaction, the changes that Mark made in the story.

(a) Mark declared the work of Jesus as Son of God to be a secret. (b) Mark historicized the story as a past event in the life of Jesus. (c) Mark also correlates the miracles of Jesus with the kerygma of Jesus. (d) Mark puts the message and work of Jesus in an eschatological framework. (e) He also gives the story its missionary thrust.

Matthew takes over the Marcan version of the story and makes the following changes: (a) The one demoniac possessed by many demons in Mark has been changed to two demoniacs; (b) Matthew also attempts to change or clarify the location of the pericope; (c) Jesus' work as the Son

of God is not a secret; (d) The miraculous deeds of Jesus have Christological significance only when they fulfill the scripture, and so the will of God expressed in the scriptures. Miraculous deeds are then an expression of Jesus' obedience; (e) Matthew heightens the eschatology of Mark and makes it more imminent--the eschatological drama has already begun; (f) Matthew narrows his use of the story to the point that its purpose is strictly Christological. For Matthew, in this story, shows no interest in the healed demoniacs or their desire to become followers of Jesus; (g) The missionary emphasis of Mark has been completely eliminated; (h) Matthew actually decreases the miracle motifs; (i) Matthew changes the Christological confession of the demons; (j) Matthew also eliminates Jesus' questioning of the demoniac, the name of the demons, and so the use of magic by Jesus.

Luke takes over the Marcan account of the story and makes the following changes: (a) The messianic secret is eliminated; (b) Luke takes over Mark's historicizing of the story and its geographical location and attempts to pinpoint the incident as occurring on gentile soil. He also attempts to establish that the demoniac himself is a gentile; (c) Mark's mountain motif is taken over and is counterbalanced by Luke's lake motif; (d) Certain of Mark's details are eliminated (e.g., the exact number of pigs, the demons crying out and the demoniac cutting himself with

stones, etc.). Also, certain implied details of Mark's version are made explicit (e.g., the demoniac's nakedness); (e) Luke introduces the concept of history of salvation with three distinct periods. (1) Jesus' ministry makes up the center period of the history of salvation which is free from Satan. (2) Luke changes the imminent eschatology of Mark to a futuristic eschatology which fits into his concept of the history of salvation. (3) Jesus' miraculous deeds become an image of the salvation which is to come--they do not signify the beginning of the eschaton.

Similarities in the Synoptic Witness:

While there are many subtle and distinct differences in the synoptic versions of the story, while the theology of the evangelists may differ, and while the significance of the miracle stories for each may differ, there are a great many similarities which are held in common by the writers of the Synoptic Gospels. In the next few paragraphs these will be set out.

(a) They all have a concept of creation which is dualistic; (b) They all have an animistic concept of disease which results in a dualistic concept of spirit possession; (c) All share in common the fact that, due to sin, evil or unclean spirits enter into men and control them with the result that man is perverted from his normal self; (d) All share in common the fact that, when demon-posses-

sion occurs, there is a marked personality change in the individual which is recognizable; (e) They all share in common the fact that the standard method for curing a demon-possessed person is the technique of exorcism; (f) Exorcism is accomplished by means of word power; (g) Demon-possession ultimately is the result of/and the work of Satan (the personification of evil and chaos in the world); (h) All have a theios anēr Christological pattern; (i) All depict Jesus as the Son of God; (j) All picture Jesus as sent by God to save man from his perverted condition; (k) The death of Jesus was the will of God; (l) The minimum understanding of the miraculous deeds of Jesus is that they are an image of salvation; (m) Salvation is understood as wholeness of life--a mode of existence which is free from the forces of evil and chaos; (n) The ultimate establishment of the Kingdom of God will not occur until God finally defeats Satan, which will culminate in the Parousia (even if it is a futuristic event) and the end of the aeon; (o) The miraculous deeds of Jesus have Christological significance only through the kerygma of the crucifixion and resurrection; (p) Jesus' miraculous deeds are actually the merciful deeds of God done by and through Jesus; (q) Due to Jesus' defeat of Satan in the temptation story the demons know who Jesus is--Son of God; (r) The people do not know who Jesus is, or they misunderstand him, with the result that they ask him to leave.

There are also several things which Mark and Luke share in common that are not commonly held by Matthew. They are: (a) Their interest in the restored condition of the demoniac; (b) The response of the demoniac to the miraculous deed of Jesus in his behalf; (c) Jesus' rejection of the healed man's request, and his subsequent commissioning of him to become a missionary proclaiming the merciful deeds of God worked through Jesus; (d) They also share many other common elements (e.g., Jesus' questioning of the demoniac, the name of the demons, Jesus' use of magic, etc.).

Conclusion of the New Testament Sections:

We have concluded that the exorcism pericope we have dealt with is probably not a historical occurrence. It is most likely a legend. It was probably assimilated into the early Christian tradition about Jesus through the Hellenistic Jewish-Christian congregation. This was Mark's source. Matthew and Luke obtained the story from Mark. It has also been stated that, even though this is not a historical occurrence in the life of Jesus, Jesus did perform miracles of exorcism. While the Synoptic writers' accounts of this pericope vary, and each evangelist's understanding of the story is different, there are several significant concepts which emerge and are held in common by the writers of the Synoptic tradition. One could even press the issue by saying that these concepts were fairly

commonly accepted in the New Testament Period. However, what will be dealt with in this conclusion of the New Testament section will be what has emerged from this study in the area of demon-possession. The study of the Synoptic materials and texts have given us many insights into the thinking of the people in the New Testament period. Several things emerged that can be stated about this period in general. They are: (a) Disorders that have their counterpart today in severe psychological disorders were, in the view of persons in the New Testament period, a result of demon-possession. In short, what we today would consider to be major psychological disorders were, in New Testament time, considered to be the result of demon-possession; (b) Demon-possession was recognized by certain behavioral characteristics. Demon-possession was attributed to those individuals who at one time or another had exhibited normal behavioral characteristics--who, for some reason or another, had shown a marked change in personality that was made visible by unacceptable forms of behavior, unacceptable ways of relating to others, and erratic forms of communication; (c) Demon-possession was the result of an animistic concept of disease; (d) There are also, in New Testament times, standards of treatment for such individuals. First, if they were very violent they were bound, in an attempt to protect them from harming themselves and others. If they

were not bound, their places of habitat were the unpopulated areas such as graveyards, deserts, and other desolate areas--they were excluded from normal community or tribal life; (e) The standard course of treatment, in an effort to cure the individual, was the technique of exorcism. There were many and varied forms or techniques of exorcism. However, all methods utilized word power; (f) Many persons performed exorcisms. Usually such individuals were religious figures of some nature (e.g., priests, Pharisees, magicians, sorcerers, etc.); (g) One must also draw the conclusion that many exorcisms were successful; (h) The main vehicle by which exorcisms were performed was communication. This was communication on several different levels. For the purpose of classification and to facilitate discussion, these levels of communication will be classified as verbal and nonverbal. Verbal communication would, of course, refer to the verbal communication between the exorcist and the demoniac which, in New Testament terminology, would be word power. Nonverbal communication would be represented by such phenomenon as the rapport that exists between the exorcist (therapist) and the demoniac (patient). Rapport in New Testament terms would be trust. Other examples which would be representative of other levels of nonverbal communication would be the symbolic meaning conveyed by various religious symbols or rituals which accompanied exorcisms. Another such example of

nonverbal communication would be the meaning conveyed by the presence of animals, or portions thereof, present during the exorcism. Also, any physical demonstration by the demoniac which occurred before, during, or after the course of the exorcism would be another form of nonverbal communication.

If any solid bridge exists between the New Testament period and its concept of mental disorders and present day thinking in this area, then it exists in some of the areas listed above, and probably it exists most precisely in the area of communication. These points will be used as the basis for the discussion in the concluding chapter.

CHAPTER VI
THE CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE OF
DEMON-POSSESSION

The purpose of this chapter is to explore and consider whether or not any parallels or similarities exist between the concept of demon-possession in the New Testament text we have dealt with, and in the New Testament period in general, and the psychological disorders which plague modern man. Also, if parallels or similarities do exist I want to explore the implications of them in the area of the minister as a counselor.

Some may feel that it is rather presumptuous to take a New Testament pericope that was not considered to be an actual event in the life of the historical Jesus--that was classified as a legend--and attempt to draw any valid parallels or conclusions between demon-possession and the present day psychological problems of modern man. However, just because the pericope is considered to be legend does not mean that it is impossible to glean a great deal of information from it that has validity. Exorcisms were a historical fact. And, as has been pointed out in the summary and conclusion of the New Testament section of the study, it became evident that several general conclusions could be drawn which not only have validity for the early Christian congregation but which were valid for this

period in antiquity in general.

The critical question is whether or not any parallels or similarities do exist in the above mentioned area. Before this question can be taken up it must be said that this is basically virgin territory. Studies on demon-possession in antiquity are numerous. Studies in modern psychological problems are voluminous. But studies that attempt to bridge the schism between the two are almost non-existent. Due to this factor I will rely heavily upon a few sources and upon my own thinking in this area.

I am firmly convinced that many parallels do exist in the above stated area. However, before these parallels are reiterated it would facilitate discussion and clear the air if some of the areas in which radical changes have occurred in man's thinking would be discussed. This is necessary, because the areas in which these major changes have occurred have affected man's entire conception of the world about him and, as a result, his own perception about his own being in that world.¹

Changing Concepts:

In the New Testament sections there were one or two

¹While these concepts seem to be, on the surface, radically different, they still share in common a great many similarities. This will be dealt with later in the chapter.

basic concepts that undergirded the pericope that was exegeted that fall into the above mentioned category.

The first and most fundamental area of disagreement is in man's formulation of a concept of creation. This is very critical; for, as has been pointed out very graphically in the New Testament sections of this study, it affected man's concept of disease.

In antiquity,² man had a mythological concept of creation, and this was reflected in the New Testament story. This mythological concept of creation which is a presupposition of the New Testament story had God, in the original act of creation, battling the forces of evil and chaos and defeating them in order to establish the earth. In defeating the forces of evil and chaos God pushed back the primeval waters (the dwelling place of evil and chaos, i.e., demons, etc.) and established the firmament, etc. Today, we no longer accept this or any other mythological concept of creation. This mythological concept of creation has been replaced by an evolutionary (naturalistic) concept of creation by modern man.³ This evolutionary concept of

²This term refers to the New Testament period in general.

³When I refer to modern man it is an inclusive term, but it is limited to those individuals in our time who have broken fully with the mythical concepts of antiquity. There are those in our day, and in many cultures, who have residual mythical concepts of antiquity in their thinking.

creation theorizes that the earth came into existence through a cosmic accident in which a part of the sun exploded off and was thrown into orbit around it (sun). It gradually cooled, and, after millions of years, very primitive forms of life began to emerge, etc. This theory of evolution or some other theory of evolution has taken the place of the older mythological concept of creation. So what has taken place is that a mythical concept of creation has given way in modern times to an evolutionary (naturalistic) concept of creation.

As a result of the mythical concept of creation in antiquity there came into being an animistic concept of disease. This animistic concept of disease had the same forces of evil and chaos which battled for supremacy of creation with God, or the gods, battling for control of men's lives. Either force could possess a man. If an evil force was said to possess the individual they were demon-possessed. If a good force was said to possess an individual he could possibly become a theios anēr. Today we have replaced this concept of disease by a naturalistic concept of disease. Mental or psychological disorders within an animistic concept of disease were a result of sin which allowed alien forces to possess a man. Psychological disorders within a naturalistic concept of disease are a result of naturalistic influences. In an animistic concept of disease man is looked at, fundamentally, as dualistic.

In a naturalistic concept of disease man is looked at as a unity. Due to the animistic concept of disease in antiquity a large part of the individual's life was devoted to rites and ceremonies intended to cultivate his spiritual friends and to protect him against his invisible enemies.⁴ One might call this antiquity's concept of good mental hygiene.

With modern medicine's complete rejection of an animistic concept of disease, treatment is now based on new concepts of personality.⁵ In demon-possession the standard treatment in an effort to effect a cure was exorcism. Due to the disappearance of an animistic concept of disease and its treatment by exorcism new physiological and psychological concepts of treatment have emerged to take their place.⁶ The exorcist with his incantations, charms, rites, and word power has today been replaced by a physician who diagnoses disease on the basis of naturalistic theories and then proceeds with treatment along rational lines.⁷ The mysteries of personality⁸ remain, but the approach and

⁴Vernon S. McCasland, By the Finger of God (New York: Macmillan, 1951), p. 15.

⁵Ibid., pp. 13f.

⁶Ibid., p. 16.

⁷Ibid.

⁸It is my firm conviction that theories of personality, etc., are still in a very rudimentary stage of development.

concepts about personality are different.⁹ Today, we are no longer concerned with fears about demons, but we are concerned about the stresses, strains, tensions, etc., of our complex and rapidly advancing civilization. These stresses, strains, tensions, etc., have taken the place of demons as the disintegrating factors of personality. These tensions, stresses, strains, etc., are as invisible today as demons were in antiquity. We spend a great deal of time, money, and effort in order to cope with these factors in modern life--this we call good mental hygiene. Personalities disintegrated in antiquity, and personalities disintegrate today. The diagnosis of personality disintegration in both periods was, and is, based on what either period considers abnormal behavioral characteristics. What has changed between then and now are our conceptions and ideas about the phenomena of personality disintegration. In short, the phenomenon (personal disintegration) remains the same, but modern science has given us new and different concepts of the phenomena.

The Parallels:

At this point I would like to digress to point out some changes which have occurred, and which are examples

⁹Ibid.

of these changing concepts, but which might still be said to have some similar or parallel characteristics.

In antiquity a severely disturbed (demon-possessed) individual was bound or chained (physically restrained) in some manner and/or was ejected from the "normal" society. Today, the very emotionally disturbed individual is institutionalized (i.e., ejected from the "normal" life patterns of the community). Some are put in padded cells or even strait-jacketed (bound and chained) and/or are given drugs in an effort to calm them down and make them manageable.¹⁰ The rites and rituals of the exorcist of antiquity has given way to the psychiatrist's particular methodology of treatment. The charms, etc., in antiquity have given way to the psychiatrist's pencil, paper, and his couch. The presence of an animal or a portion thereof into which the demon was to pass as a demonstration of the successfulness of the exorcism, has given way to concepts of transference and various psychological examinations. Demon-possession has given way to personality theories. Exorcisms have given way to various forms of therapy.

In the foregoing discussion it has been pointed out that there are some very basic elements which are common to each period of history in the area of attitudes and

¹⁰Both in antiquity and today these measures were and are done for basically the same reasons.

treatment of the phenomena of personality disintegration. Most basic and common to both periods is that in all that has been discussed, it reflects man's own thinking about himself and the world or universe of which he is a part, in which he is attempting to adapt and to live. What is reflected more than any other single factor is man's changing thought processes. I doubt very much that modern man has reached the point of obtaining or ascertaining the ultimate truth about anything. He might have a glimpse of the ultimate truth in some areas, but I am positive that man's thinking will continue to change in the future as he obtains more information about himself and the universe in which he lives. What this short discussion indicates more than anything else is: (a) man's ability to adapt his thought processes upon obtaining new and/or different information; (b) The human personality is in a state of dynamic flux; (c) Since the human personality is in a state of dynamic flux, man's response or adaptation to new and/or different information will vary. It can range from a very positive to a very negative response.

As previously stated, knowledge of personality is still in a rudimentary stage of development, but many things are apparent. Animism has been discarded and in its place has emerged a concept of an organic relationship between body and mind.

Today we speak of the psychobiological organism which replaces the older dualistic idea with one of unity.¹¹ However, one thing remains evident, whether in antiquity or today, and that is--in the depths of personality there are always the repressed tendencies struggling for expression which are capable, under certain conditions, of producing inner conflicts turbulent and violent enough to upset the balance required for sound, mental health.¹² What is sound or good mental health greatly depends on what the cultural concepts are as to what type of behavior constitutes good mental health, or what type behavior constitutes abnormal states of mental health.

In the New Testament story and in the various treatments of the text by the various evangelists, salvation was described as the restoration of creation from a perverted state to a condition of wholeness. When this concept of salvation was placed on a personal plane the demoniac was restored to his full humanity. Full humanity meant that the demoniac was completely restored mentally and physically. He was restored to society and was socially acceptable. He was culturally re-orientated. The restoration of the

¹¹Edward A. Strecker and Franklin G. Ebaugh, Practical Clinical Psychiatry (Philadelphia: Blakeston, 1940), pp. 4-49.

¹²McCasland, op. cit., p. 22.

demoniac's full humanity in socio-religious terminology could be depicted as the demoniac being in a proper relationship with himself, with society, and with God. Is it not possible that these are also the same goals of present day pastoral counseling?

The entire thrust of the discussion up to this point can best be expressed in a quotation from McCasland's book, By the Finger of God.

The scientifically trained student is not concerned with names or vocabulary in this respect, but with essential mental phenomena. He knows that religious, medical, and scientific vocabularies change radically from age to age. The words possession and exorcism, together with the complex ideas upon which they are based, might disappear completely from a people's thought, while the exact same mental phenomena continue to occur but are designated by different words and interpreted by a new set of general ideas. We ought to look about us in our time for the old terminology, but it is much more important to look behind new medical and scientific words for the old experience. We are not concerned so much about words and phrases as about essential things that occur in human personality.¹³

Present day psychiatry has produced an interesting vocabulary in its efforts to describe what the mind does when it becomes ill, e.g., rationalization, complex, dissociation, projection, psychoneurosis, introjection, symbolism, and psychosis, etc. All of these can occur in normal individuals to a limited degree, but they become especially obvious in pathological behavior.¹⁴

¹³Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 22.

Modern science has divided psychoses basically into three categories: (a) organic; (b) toxic; and (c) psychogenic.¹⁵ Organic psychoses usually result from syphilis, senility, arteriosclerosis, epilepsy, head injuries, and neurological disorders.¹⁶ Toxic psychoses usually result from alcoholism, metal poisoning, drugs, and certain organic diseases.¹⁷ Psychogenic psychoses such as paranoia, schizophrenia, mental deficiency, and various psychoneuroses are psychogenic in origin.¹⁸ Psychoses resulting from organic and toxic conditions could be relieved only by treating their specific organic and toxic causes.¹⁹ The therapists might include anything in the range of medical science.²⁰ Psychoses which are psychogenic in origin, on the other hand, would presumably yield only to a treatment or therapy which is psychological in nature.²¹ Psychological therapy might be used to advantage as a supplement to the other treatment in organic and toxic psychoses.²² However, the main area where the practice of exorcism and psychiatry (modern therapy) meet are in the areas of psychoses which are psychogenic in origin.²³ What the physicians of our time call disorganization of the mind,

¹⁵Ibid., p. 25.

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 25f.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid.

²³Ibid.

neuroses or psychoses, the ancients called demon-possession.²⁴

Demon-Possession and Modern Therapy Meet:

The central point at which exorcism techniques and modern therapeutic techniques meet is in the area of communications. In antiquity the technique of exorcism used many different means and levels of communication. These means and levels of communication consisted of both non-verbal and verbal.²⁵ However, the crux of the technique of exorcism was through word power. Today the matrix of modern therapeutic techniques, methodologies, procedures, etc., rests upon the concept of therapeutic communications.²⁶ Jurgen Ruesch²⁷ has said that almost all phenomena included under the traditional heading psychopathology are disturbances of communication and that such disturbances are in part defined by the cultures in which they occur. In a theory of communication there are various types of communication. However, in therapeutic communica-

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵These are discussed briefly in the previous chapter.

²⁶Jurgen Ruesch, Therapeutic Communication (New York: Norton, 1961).

²⁷Jurgen Ruesch and Gregory Bateson, Communication the Social Matrix of Psychiatry (New York: Norton, 1951), p. 5.

tions, which is the matrix of psychiatry (counseling), one is basically interested in two levels of communication. These two levels of communication are: (a) intrapersonal; and (b) interpersonal.

Today most abnormalities of behavior are described in terms of disturbances of communication.²⁸ The basic goal of psychiatric therapy, or any type of therapy, is to improve the communication system of the patient.²⁹ The nature of all psychotherapy is such that, regardless of the school of thought adhered to or the technical terms used, the therapist's operation always occurs in a social context of some nature. Implicitly, therefore, all therapists use communications as a method of influencing the patient.³⁰ The differences that exist between the patient and the therapist are differences of their personal value systems that can ultimately be traced to differences in the codification or evaluation of perceived events.³¹ Psychotherapists then concentrate upon aspects of behavior that, in the course of therapy, are likely to change.³² In therapy there are many variables to take into account. These are: (a) structurally organic determinants; (b) animistic forces; (c) humanistic forces; (d) effector deter-

²⁸Ibid., p. 19.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Ibid.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid., p. 51.

minants; and (e) environmental determinants.³³ These variables are capable of fluctuating between progression and regression.³⁴ If psychotherapy is defined in terms of communication (perception-expression) then the therapist must attempt to find out and determine what has caused the disruption of the interchange of messages.³⁵ This not only involves the undoing of already established patterns of communication but would frequently necessitate the teaching of the basic elements of human communication.

Therapeutic communication has previously been mentioned, but no definition was given. A very basic or fundamental definition might be that whenever a priest, nurse, doctor, or lay person helps another human being some elements of therapeutic communications are involved or have been used, regardless of the external situation.³⁶ Therapeutic communications makes use of all the numerous means and ways of communicating that human beings are capable of engaging in.³⁷ At this juncture it would be advisable to distinguish between ordinary communications and therapeutic communications. What differentiates therapeutic communica-

³³Ibid., pp. 64f.

³⁴Ibid., p. 66.

³⁵Ibid., p. 82.

³⁶J. Ruesch, Therapeutic Communication, p. XIV.

³⁷Ibid., p. 451.

tions from ordinary communications is that in therapeutic communications the intention of one or more of the participants is clearly directed at bringing about a change in the system and manner of communication of another participant.³⁸ Then what can be said is that, within therapeutic communications, the function of the therapist is to steer communications in such a manner that the patient is exposed to situations and message exchanges which eventually will bring about more gratifying social relationships.³⁹

Is it not possible to apply this theory of therapeutic communication to demon-possession and the technique of exorcism with its various levels and types of communication? Is it not also possible to apply this same theory of therapeutic communication to the minister in his various functions and, particularly, as counselor? The area of pastoral counseling is not the only area in which a minister is active where he has the potential to engage in therapeutic communications.⁴⁰ The reverse is also possible. That is, many ministers engage in activities which, rather than enhance their own mental health and the mental health of others, create havoc and contribute to their own

³⁸Ibid., p. 460.

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰For a complete and detailed discussion of these areas, cf., Howard J. Clinebell, Jr., Mental Health Through Christian Community (New York: Abingdon Press, 1965).

and other's poor mental hygiene. As previously stated, the most obvious role of the minister in which therapeutic communication could be expected to take place would be in his role as counselor. However, I feel that this role has been too narrowly defined and/or restricted to the counseling situation per se. Almost every situation in which a pastor is engaged has the potential to be developed into some form of therapeutic situation.

If one accepts the broad socio-religious concept of salvation displayed in the New Testament text, would it not also be plausible to define good mental health in these same terms? An individual's good mental health is the goal of present day pastoral counseling. Then the concept of salvation in our text that is defined by its socio-religious connotations is also the goal of present day mental health, and this in turn is the goal of a pastoral counselor in the counseling situation.

Even though one has discredited the historical reliability of our text it has been possible to glean a great deal of information from it about antiquity's concept of mental disorders and its treatment. Even though it is not possible to give an accurate psychoanalytical diagnosis of the demoniac's problem it is possible to draw the conclusion that the demoniac was psychologically disorientated.

And, even though man's vocabulary and concepts have changed radically with respect to disease, its cause, its

treatment, and its relationship to his own being, it is possible to affirm that many parallels and similarities do exist between antiquity and the present period. These parallels and similarities exist from the diagnostic stage, through treatment, the goals of treatment, and the cure of psychological disorders.

Up to this point in the chapter demon-possession and its contemporary relevance has been dealt with mainly from a literalistic point of view. In this section the concept of demon-possession and its contemporary relevance for the minister as counselor will be pursued one step further. This will be accomplished by gleening insights from Tillich's, Freud's, and Jung's treatment of the demonic element within man's nature. The purpose of this is to gain deeper insights into the nature of man which will be pertinent to the minister as counselor.

The Demonic in the Thought of Paul Tillich:

Paul Tillich⁴¹ speaks about the demonic element within man. Man suffers from "existential estrangement" which is the demonic in his experience.⁴² There are many

⁴¹Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957-63), II, 51ff., II, 102-106; and Dynamics of Faith (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), 15ff.

⁴²Tillich, Systematic Theology, II, 171.

things which contribute to or cause man's "existential estrangement." Each is of vital concern to the minister as counselor, because each source of a person's "existential estrangement" gives the minister as counselor key insights into the depth dimensions of the human personality. These key insights can become the guide-posts for therapy. Also, if a pastor can become sensitized to these dimensions of the human personality it can facilitate and enhance his total ministry. One of the key causes of man's "existential estrangement" is man's unwillingness to accept his temporality.⁴³ This is a result of man's inability to accept his own finitude, i.e., death. All ministers deal with death in many different situations. Consequently, this is a vital concern to the minister.

Man's inability to accept his own finitude would indicate that a minister must deal with his personal feelings and attitudes concerning his own death and the finitude of man in general. Next, one of the crucial issues in a man's total ministry would be to help persons to come to terms with and to accept death--for man's inability to accept his own finitude is a source of "existential estrangement" which in turn is a source of the demonic within man's experience. Another major source of man's

⁴³Ibid., II, 69.

"existential estrangement" or "splitness"⁴⁴ is "concupiscence." That is the unlimited desire within man to draw the whole of reality into one's self.⁴⁵ This desire within man to draw the whole of reality into one's self might possibly be understood as man attempting to play God. This "omnipotent" complex is of very special significance for the minister as counselor (or, for that matter, ministers in general), for he is in a position which makes him particularly vulnerable to attempting to play God, not only in his own situation but with all who place their faith and trust in him by coming to him for guidance. Another source of this "splitness," which is characteristic of the demonic in man, is the consequence of one placing as their focus for their "ultimate concern" something which is less than ultimate.⁴⁶ This also implies that if one makes absolute claims about their "ultimate concern" that this too is demonic. In Tillich's own words:

The demonic self-elevation of particular forces in the centered personality and the claims of their absolute superiority leads to the reaction of other forces and to a split consciousness. The claim of one value, represented by one God, to be the criterion of all

⁴⁴According to Tillich, "splitness" is the main characteristic of the demonic. Cf., Tillich, Systematic Theology, III, 103.

⁴⁵Tillich, Systematic Theology, II, 52.

⁴⁶Tillich, Dynamics of Faith, pp. 15f.

others leads to the splits in polytheistic religion.

A consequence of these splits connected with the nature of the demonic, is the state of being "possessed" by the power which produces the split. The demoniacs are the possessed ones.⁴⁷

Here Tillich points out that the holy can become demonic--that is, that the holy has the potential to ultimately become destructive. Then it is possible for one's "ultimate concern" to destroy one's self as well as heal him.⁴⁸ Man can elevate many things to becoming the focus of his "ultimate concern" which are less than ultimate; e.g., himself, nationalism, pride, security, church, faith, etc. When this occurs, man's "ultimate concern" is demonic, because he becomes "possessed" by the focus of his "ultimate concern." When this occurs, man suffers from "existential estrangement" or "splitness."

The goal of healing, then, is to overcome man's "existential estrangement" or "splitness" and to achieve wholeness.⁴⁹ Making whole means to reunite, or overcoming the split between God and man, man and his world, man and himself.⁵⁰ These same results were obtained when Jesus was said to have healed the demoniac.

⁴⁷Tillich, Systematic Theology, III, 103.

⁴⁸Tillich, Dynamics of Faith, p. 16.

⁴⁹Tillich, Systematic Theology, II, 165.

⁵⁰Ibid.

The value of what Tillich has to say to the minister as counselor lies in the area of his keen insight into the nature of man and his religious orientation. Man's religious orientation has a twofold potential--it can be demonic, i.e., possess him, or it can heal him.

The Demonic in the Thought of Sigmund Freud:

While Tillich talked about the demonic element of man in theological concepts, Sigmund Freud talked about the demonic in psychological terminology and concepts. Freud's treatment of the demonic within man's experience also gives the minister as counselor much pertinent data to help him in his search to come to an adequate understanding of the depth dynamics in the nature of man. Freud⁵¹ calls demon-possession a neurosis. Freud⁵² analyzes a case history of demon-possession taken from the middle ages where a man, Christoph Haizmann, was said to have made two pacts with the Devil after the death of his father. Freud comes to the following conclusions about the case: First, that no Devil ever appeared to Christoph Haizmann, and that the whole business of pacts with the Devil only existed in his imagination;⁵³ secondly, what

⁵¹Sigmund Freud, The Ego and The Id and Other Works (London: Hogarth Press, 1961), XIX, 100.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 69-104.

⁵³Ibid., p. 98.

caused the demonological illness was that Christoph Haizmann could not accept some basic drive or thought.⁵⁴ In Freud's⁵⁵ thinking demons were and are reprehensible wishes, derivatives of instinctual impulses that have been repudiated and repressed. What modern man has done is merely eliminated the projection of these mental entities into the external world which in earlier ages man carried out.⁵⁶ Instead, today we regard them as having arisen in the patient's internal life, where they have their abode.⁵⁷ What Freud is saying is that within each individual there can arise from their psychic depths instinctual wishes which are so base that some individuals refuse to recognize them as having originated from within themselves, i.e., from the depths of their own psyche. Consequently, these instinctual wishes and/or desires are looked upon as originating outside of one's self and, therefore, as something foreign--i.e., demonic.

The Demonic in the Thought of Jung:

C. G. Jung has built upon the work of Freud in this area and has come up with what he calls man's "dark shadow."⁵⁸ Jung talks about "dark shadow" in several cate-

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 101.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 72.

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸C. G. Jung, The Undiscovered Self (New York: Mentor Books, 1959), p. 108.

gories, but, basically, they all point to the evil that is inherent in the depths of man's psyche. The following is a quotation from Jung which gives a key insight into the question of the evil which exists in man.

If we normal people examine our lives, we too can perceive how a mighty hand guides us without fail to our destiny, and not always is this hand a kindly one. Often we call it the hand of God or the devil, thereby expressing, unconsciously but correctly, a highly important psychological fact: that the power which shapes the life of the psyche has the character of an autonomous personality. At all events it is felt as such, so that today in common speech, as in ancient times, the source of any such destiny appears as a demon, or a good or evil spirit.⁵⁹

Jung⁶⁰ points out that only unconscious and wholly uncritical people can imagine it plausible for one to abide and remain in a continual state of moral goodness. But because most persons are devoid of self-criticism, permanent self-deception is the norm. Jung⁶¹ states that there is scarcely any other psychic phenomenon that demonstrated the polarity of the psyche in a clearer light than conscience. The undoubted dynamism of the conscience can only be explained in terms of energy--that is as a potential based on opposites.⁶² These opposites can best be understood in terms of good or evil. Good and evil are only

⁵⁹C. G. Jung, Collected Works (New York: Pantheon, 1957-19__), IV, 314.

⁶⁰Ibid., X, 447.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Ibid.

principles of ethical judgment.⁶³ However, one's lack of insight deprives one of the capacity to deal with evil.⁶⁴ Jung also calls the concept of demon-possession a neurosis where something objectively psychic and strange to the individual, not under their control, is fixedly opposed to the sovereignty of their will.⁶⁵

A person must come to terms with the dark shadow within himself before it is possible for him to move on to the beauty which is also inherent within one's self.⁶⁶ However, no light or beauty will ever come from the man who cannot bear the sight of his own dark shadow.⁶⁷ In Jungian terminology man must discover himself.⁶⁸ This is accomplished through self-knowledge.⁶⁹ However, the greatest obstacle to self-knowledge is the fear of the unconscious psyche.⁷⁰ Self-knowledge means that man must come to terms with the evil that is inherent in his make-up.⁷¹ The dark side of man's personality is much greater than

⁶³Ibid., X, 458

⁶⁴Ibid., X, 297.

⁶⁵Ibid., X, 146.

⁶⁶C. G. Jung, Modern Man in Search of a Soul (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1933), p. 215.

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸C. G. Jung, The Undiscovered Self, p. 61.

⁶⁹Ibid.

⁷⁰Ibid.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 107.

that of Adam and Eve.⁷² We are all potential criminals, and none of us stands outside of humanities' black collective shadow.⁷³ Further, only the fool can permanently neglect the condition of his own nature.⁷⁴ In fact, Jung says, "this negligence is the best means of making him an instrument of evil."⁷⁵ Lack of insight, then, deprives one of the capacity to deal with evil.⁷⁶ The Christian viewpoint, particularly Protestant, has a prejudice toward this attitude; for the Christian view exonerates man's conscience of too heavy a responsibility and pawns it off on the devil.⁷⁷ Jung continues by saying we need to recognize the dark collective shadow within us, for it leads to the modesty one needs to acknowledge imperfection.⁷⁸ It is just this conscious recognition and consideration that is needed whenever a human relationship is to be established.⁷⁹ The basis for establishing human relationships is imperfection, which is the very ground and motive of dependence.⁸⁰

If I understand what Jung is saying when he talks about man's dark collective shadow it is that man must come to terms with himself through the process of self-knowledge,

⁷²Ibid.

⁷³Ibid., p. 108.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 109.

⁷⁵Ibid.

⁷⁶Ibid.

⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 110f.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 116.

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Ibid., pp. 116f.

i.e., by exploring his own soul. The individual must come to terms with himself in a wholeistic way which encompasses both the dark shadow and the light, which together make up the energy source of man's personality. This means that a minister as counselor must become aware of his own dark shadow as well as helping others to come to terms with their dark shadow.⁸¹

The dark shadow as a source of psychic energy can also have a very creative thrust in man's personality. This is only possible when a man is willing to recognize and accept his own dark shadow. When this occurs the psychic energy which has previously been used as a defense against the dark shadow becomes freed to be used creatively.

This entire section about the demonic in man and the insights of all the men mentioned into the demonic element in man and how it relates to an understanding of the nature of man can best be summed up in the words of James Hillman:

. . . the reality of the shadow in counseling means that honesty is a grace that we cannot expect--neither from those who come to us and from ourselves to them, nor from anyone to God. The Devil and our devil-likeness means treachery, even when we have the best intentions. This is the reality of evil. Darkness is never dispersed as long as we are human and walk in the

⁸¹James Hillman, Insearch (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967), p. 91.

shadow of original sin, and Lucifer is the original sin. The lie and the cheat are ever present; and even honesty from God can be doubted, since in the case of Job He gave His ear to Satan. Facing the reality of evil, however, does not mean cynicism. It means merely that the optimism of honest-to-God be shaded in with the pessimism of psychological reality. To be honest-to-God we would first have to know a great deal more about truth--and what is truth? A hint toward knowledge of the whole truth might be found through a psychological reappraisal of the enigmatic robbers and thieves surrounding Jesus during his last human hours.⁸²

For many individuals, including the minister, it will be difficult to accept one's dark shadow without attaching some type of moral connotation to it. However, this does not really constitute acceptance; consequently, one must work toward real acceptance which means to accept and affirm one's dark shadow without attaching any moral connotation to it.

Summary and Conclusion:

What does all this indicate or mean for the minister as counselor? One may not believe in demon-possession per se but it is still possible to experience the demonic or to be "possessed." The demonic may be experienced in the terms of Freud as the repression and/or rejection of some instinctual wish and/or desire so base that the individual refuses to recognize it as having originated from within himself. Consequently, these instinctual wishes and/or

⁸²Ibid., p. 92.

desires are looked upon as originating outside of one's self and, therefore, as something demonic. Or, in Tillich's terms, one might become "possessed." One becomes possessed due to "splitness." Splitness is the consequence of placing as the focus for one's "ultimate concern" something which is less than ultimate. The power (i.e., ultimate concern which is less than ultimate) which produces the split then possesses the individual. From the Jungian perspective, if an individual is not able to come to terms with his own dark shadow through "self-knowledge," he will deny the dark shadow. And, if an individual denies his own dark shadow, unknowingly that individual can become an instrument of evil.

If one attempts to relate this to the Biblical concept of demon-possession it becomes very apparent that similarities do exist. In the Biblical perspective the demoniacs are the "possessed" ones. This has similarities with Tillich's concept of the demoniacs as the "possessed" ones, although they are not literally the same. From the Biblical perspective demon-possession occurs when an individual is possessed by an evil spirit that is foreign to his normal personhood. This also has its contemporary counterpart in Freud's description of the demonic as the repression and/or rejection of some instinctual wish or desire so base that the individual refuses to recognize it

as having originated from within himself and is therefore experienced as something foreign. In the Biblical account the demoniac was an instrument of evil to himself and others. This has its contemporary counterpart in Jung's description of the individual's denial or rejection of his own dark shadow and thereby becoming an instrument of evil. In the Biblical account healing is constituted by the demoniac's restoration to wholeness. In the contemporary setting healing is also constituted by wholeness. Therefore, it is perfectly legitimate for one to say that, while man's concept of personality has radically changed between the periods represented by the New Testament and today, there still remain many similarities and parallels. One of the similarities and/or parallels is constituted by both period's insights into the demonic nature of man.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BOOKS

- Argyle, A. W. The Gospel According to Matthew. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.
- Arndt, F. William. St. Luke. St. Louis: Concordia, 1956.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. Studies in Matthew. New York: Holt, 1930.
- Barclay, William. The Gospel of Luke. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953.
- _____. The Gospel of Matthew. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958.
- Barrett, C. K. Luke the Historian in Recent Study. London: Epworth Press, 1961.
- Barth, Karl. The Great Promise. New York: Philosophical Library, 1963.
- Beare, Frank, W. The Earliest Record of Jesus. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Best, Ernest. The Temptation and the Passion: The Marcan Soteriology. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.
- Bornkamm, Günther. Jesus of Nazareth. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.
- _____, G. Barth, and H. J. Held. Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Bowman, John. The Gospel of Mark. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Braaten, Carl E., and Roy A. Harrisville (eds.). The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ. New York: Abingdon Press, 1964.
- Browning, W. R. F. The Gospel According to Saint Luke. New York: Macmillan, 1960.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. History of the Synoptic Tradition. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- _____. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951-55.

- Caird, G. B. The Gospel of St. Luke. Baltimore: Penguin, 1963.
- Childs, Brevard S. Myth and Reality in the Old Testament. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Clinebell, Howard J., Jr. Mental Health Through Christian Community. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. The Gospel According to St. Mark. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.
- Creed, John M. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Macmillan, 1953.
- Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
- _____. Gospel Criticism and Christology. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1935.
- _____. Jesus. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1949.
- Eltester, Walther (ed.). Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. Berlin: Topelmann, 1954.
- Epstein, I. (ed.). The Babylonian Talmud. 35 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1935-52.
- Erdman, Charles R. The Gospel of Luke. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1925.
- Farrar, F. W. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Cambridge: University Press, 1903.
- Feine, W., J. Behm, and N. G. Kümmel. Introduction to the New Testament. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Fenton, J. C. St. Matthew. Baltimore: Penguin, 1963.
- Filson, Floyd V. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

- Freud, Sigmund. The Ego and The Id and Other Works. (His standard works, vol. 19.) London: Hogarth Press, 1961.
- Fuchs, Ernst. Studies of the Historical Jesus. Naperville: Allenson, 1964.
- Fuller, R. H. Foundations of New Testament Christology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
- _____. Interpreting the Miracles. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Goguel, Maurice. The Life of Jesus. London: Allen and Unwin, 1933.
- Gould, E. P. The Gospel According to St. Mark. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- Grant, Robert M. Miracle and Natural Law in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Thought. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1952.
- Guignebert, Charles. Jesus. New York: University Books, 1959.
- Hillman, James. Insearch. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.
- Jung, Carl G. The Collected Works. vols. New York: Pantheon, 1957-
- _____. Modern Man in Search of a Soul. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1933.
- _____. The Undiscussed Self. New York: Mentor Books, 1959.
- Kallas, James. The Significance of the Synoptic Miracles. London: S. P. C. K., 1961.
- Käsemann, Ernst. Essays on New Testament Themes. Naperville: Allenson, 1964.
- Knox, Wilfred L. The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1953-57.
- Kümmel, W. G. Promise and Fulfilment. Naperville: Allenson, 1956.

- Langton, Edward. Essentials of Demonology. London: Epworth Press, 1949.
- Leaney, A. R. C. The Gospel According to St. Luke. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.
- Leslie, Robert C. Jesus and Logotherapy. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Lewis, C. S. Miracles: A Preliminary Study. New York: Macmillan, 1947.
- Ling, Trevor. The Significance of Satan. London: Allen and Unwin, 1961.
- Loos, H. van der. The Miracles of Jesus. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Manson, William. Jesus the Messiah. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946.
- _____. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1949.
- Mauser, Ulrich. Christ in the Wilderness. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- McCasland, Vernon S. By the Finger of God. New York: Macmillan, 1951.
- Nineham, D. E. The Gospel of St. Mark. Baltimore: Penguin, 1963.
- Parker, Pierson. The Gospel Before Mark. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Plummer, Alfred. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Stock, 1909.
- _____. The Gospel According to St. Luke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- Preisendanz, Karl. Papyri Graecae Magicae. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928.
- Robinson, J. M. The Problem of History in Mark. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- Robinson, T. H. The Gospel of Matthew. New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1928.

- Richardson, Alan. The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Ruesch, Jurgen. Therapeutic Communication. New York: Norton, 1961.
- _____, and Gregory Bateson. Communication the Social Matrix of Psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1951.
- Strecker, Edward A., and Franklin G. Ebaugh. Practical Clinical Psychiatry. Philadelphia: Blakeston, 1940.
- Tasker, R. V. G. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- Taylor, Vincent. Behind the Third Gospel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.
- _____. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. New York: Macmillan, 1953.
- Tillich, Paul. Systematic Theology. 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957-63.
- _____. Dynamics of Faith. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Tittle, Ernst F. The Gospel According to St. Luke. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Titus, E. L. Essentials of New Testament Studies. New York: Ronald Press, 1958.
- Ward, A. M. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Epworth Press, 1961.

II. PERIODICALS

- Bonnell, J. S. "Jesus and Demon-Possession," Theology Today, XIII (July 1956), 208-209.
- _____. "Demoniac of Gerasa," Pastoral Psychology, VII:66 (September 1956), 23-26.
- Bonner, Campbell. "Technique of Exorcism," Harvard Theological Review, XXXVI (January 1943), 39-49.

- Braun, Herbert. "The Problem of a New Testament Theology," Journal for Theology and the Church, I (1965), 169-81.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Problem of Miracles," Religion in Life, XXVII (Winter 1957-58), 63-75.
- Burkill, T. A. "Notion of Miracle," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, L:1 (1959), 33-48.
- _____. "Concerning Mk. 5:7 and 5:18-20," Studia Theologica, XI:2 (1957), 159-66.
- Cave, C. H. "Obedience of Unclean Spirits," New Testament Studies, XI:1 (October 1964), 93-97.
- Day, E. "Jesus as a Mental Therapist," Open Court, XXXVIII (December 1924), 760-68.
- Drower, E. S. "The Mandaeans To-day," Hibbert Journal, XXXVII (April 1939), 435-47.
- Freed, Stanley A. and Ruth S. "Spirit Possession as Illness in a North Indian Village," Ethnology, III:2 (April 1964), 152-71.
- Hahn, F. "Healing and Salvation," Study Encounter, II:3 (1966), 128-37.
- Hamer, John and Irene. "Spirit Possession and Its Socio-Psychological Implications Among the Sidamo of Southwest Ethiopia," Ethnology, V:4 (October 1966), 392-408.
- Kelly, H. A. "Devil in the Desert," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVI:2 (April 1964), 190-220.
- Knox, W. L. "Jewish Liturgical Exorcism," Harvard Theological Review, XXXI (July 1938), 191-203.
- Levi Della Veda, G. "El 'Elyon in Genesis 14:18-20," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIII (March 1944), 1-18.
- Mischel, W. and F. "Psychological Aspects of Spirit Possession," American Anthropology, LX (April 1958), 249-60.
- Robinson, J. M. "Mark's Understanding of History," Scottish Journal of Theology, IX:4 (December 1956), 394-409.

- Rodd, C. S. "Spirit or Finger," Expository Times, LXXII (February 1961), 157-58.
- Schindler, C. J. "Demonic Possession in the Synoptic Gospels," Luthern Church Quarterly, I (October 1928), 385-414.
- Songer, H. S. "Demonic Possession and Mental Illness," Religion in Life, XXXVI (Spring 1967), 249-60.
- Tannehill, R. "Study in the Theology of Luke-Acts," Anglican Theological Review, XLIII (April 1961), 195-203.
- Waddle, W. "Miracles of Healing," American Journal of Psychology, XX(April 1909), 219-68.
- Weber, H. R. "Christ's Victory over the Satanic Powers," Study Encounter, II:3 (1966), 160-65.
- Wright, L. E. "Are Demons Outmoded?" Journal of Religious Thought, XVIII:1 (1961), 5-21.

III. OTHER SOURCES

- Bauer, W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Betz, H. D. "Jesus as Divine Man." Mimeographed paper.
- _____. "The Problems of Christology in the New Testament." School of Theology, Claremont, Fall 1967-68, Lecture Course.
- Foerster, Werner. "δαίμων," in Kittel, G. (ed.), Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), IV, 1-20.

116824

CLAREMONT, CALIF.